MANUAL

OF

PATROLOGY

AND

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY

BY

F. CAYRÉ, A. A.

TRANSLATED BY

HOWITT, A.A., D.D

SECOND VOLUME

THIRD & FOURTH BOOKS

SOCIETY OF ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST

Desclée & Co.

JPrinters to the Holy See and the Sacred Congregation of Rites

PARIS, TOURNAI, ROME

1940

Printed in Belgium

Nihil obstat.

Guillelmus Can. Collingwood, D. D.

Censor deputatus.

Nottinghamiæ, die ii Martii 1940.

Imprimatur.

Tornaci, die 29 Martii 1940.

J. Lecouvet, Vic. Gen.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

sh translation of "Précis de Patrologie el d'Histoire de la ie", copyrighted 1930 by DESCLÉE & Co, Paris).

CONTENTS OF THE IInd VOLUME

BOOK III

THE END OF PATRISTIC LITERATURE.

(Third period : 430-800)

Introduction 1-14

I. — General outline. Division.....1
II. —The social environment..... 2
A. — The East.....2
B. — The West.....5
III. — Literary works. Doctrine..... 7
A. — Traits in common.....7
B. — The West.....8
C. — The East..... 9
IV. — Terminology of the Greek Fathers in the Christological controversies.....10
A. — The word ουσια (essentia).....11
B. — The word φύσι (natura).....11
C. — The hypostasis ὑποστασι I2
D. — The word προσωπον.....14

FIRST PART.

PATRISTIC LITERATURE FROM 430 TO 553.

FIRST SECTION.

CHAPTER I. — Nestorius.....15-19

CHAPTER II. — Saint Cyril of Alexandria . . . 19-40

I. — Life and Works 20
A. — The man. His character.....20
B. — His literary work.....22
II. —Saint Cyril and the Nestorian controversy 26
A. — Before the Council.....26
B. — The Council of Ephesus..... 28
C. — After the Council.....31
III. — Saint Cyril's doctrine..... 33
A. — The Doctor.....33
B. — His Christological teaching..... 34
C. — Sanctifying Grace and Christian Life 37

CHAPTER III. — Theodoret of Cyrus 40-46
I. — Theodoret's Life and Works 40
II. —Theodoret and the Christological controversy. 44
CHAPTER IV. — Syriac Literature in and after the Vth century 46-51
I. — The School of Edessa 47
II. —The School of Nisibis 48
III. — Official Doctrine of the Nestorian Church 49
CHAPTER V. — Monophysitism 52-71
I. — Origins of Monophysitism. Eutyches 52
II. —Condemnation of Monophysitism 54
III. — Various kinds of Monophysitism 57
A. — Strict Monophysitism 58
B. — Mitigated Monophysitism 59
IV. — Monophysitism at Constantinople 60
V. — Monophysitism at Alexandria 63
VI. — Monophysitism in Syria 66
A. — Authors who wrote in Greek 66
B. — Authors who wrote in Syriac 7°
CHAPTER VI. — The Adversaries of Monophysitism. — Leontius Byzantinus 71-78
I. — Adversaries of Monophysitism before Leontius Byzantinus 71
A. — Bishops 72
B. — Monks 72
II. — Leontius Byzantinus 73
A. — Life and Works 73
B. — Christological teaching 75
CHAPTER VII. — Justinian 1 78-86
I. — Life and Works of Justinian. His theological influence. 79
II. — Justinian and the Three Chapters 83
CHAPTER VIII. — Dionysius the Areopagite 86-101
I. — Writings *ascribed* to Dionysius the Areopagite 87
II. —The author of the writings 91
III. — Teaching of Dionysius the Areopagite 93
A. — Philosophy 93
B. — Mystical doctrine
C. — Systematic Theology

CHAPTER IX. — Secondary Authors. Exegetes, Orators, Ascetics and Historians.....102-114

I. — Exegetes.....102

II. —Orators.....104

III. — Ascetics and Mystics.....107

IV. —Historians and Chroniclers.....in

CHAPTER X. — Early Armenian Literature . . 114-121

I. —The founders of Armenian literature . . . [I5

II. —Disciples and successors of Mesrob.....117

III. — Armenian Historians.....119

SECOND SECTION.

CHAPTER XI. — Saint Leo the Great - - - - 122-141

I. —Works and Character of St. Leo.....123

II. —Saint Leo's Pontificate.....126

A. — St. Leo and Christian Unity - - - - - - 126

B. — St. Leo and the Princes.....130

HI. — The Doctrine of St. Leo.....132

A. — Christology.....133

B. — Grace.....134

C. —The Sacraments.....135

D. — The Church.....139

CHAPTER XII. — St. Leo's Successors in the Papacy. 141-154

I. — Saint Gelasius.....142

A. — Before St. Gelasius.....142

B. — St. Gelasius.....143

II. —Saint Hormisdas 146

HI. — Vigilius and Pelagius . - 150

IV. — Appendix to the question of the Three Chapters. — Their African partisans.....153

CHAPTER XIII. — Orators.....154-161

I. —Saint Peter Chrysologus.....154

II. —Saint Maximus of Turin.....155

HI. — Saint Ennodius of Pavia.....156

IV. —Salvianus.....159

CHAPTER XIV. — Theologians of the School of Lerins 161-175
I. — The Abbey of Lerins. Teaching on Grace . j6i
II. —Saint Hilary of Arles 165
III. — Saint Eucherius of Lyons. 166
IV. —Saint Vincent of Lerins . . 167
V. — Faustus of Riez.....
VI. — Arnobius the Younger 174

CHAPTER XV. — The Augustinian Theologians . 175-199
— The disciples of St. Augustine in general
A. — General outline.....
B. — St. Augustine's disciples and grace. 176
II. —Marius Mercator..... 178
III. — Claudianus Mamertus..... 179
IV. — Julianus Pomarus..... 180
V. — St. Prosper of Aquitania..... 184
A. — Life and Works of St. Prosper 184
B. — St. Prosper's Theology..... 186
VI. — St. Fulgentius of Ruspe..... 191
A. — Life and Works of St. Fulgentius . 191
B. St. Fulgentius the Doctor. His teaching 196

CHAPTER XVI. — Saint Caesarius of Arles. 199-209
— Life and Works of St. Caesarius. His pastoral worl . «99
A. — Bishop and Primate..... 199
— The Preacher..... 201
— Doctrinal activities at the I Ind Council of Orange . J
— Saint Caesarius and Monachism

CHAPTER XVII. — Christian Poets . 209-217
I. — Saint Avitus..... . 209
II. —Saint Sidonius Apollinaris
HI. — Various poets in Gaul and Italy
IV. — Saint Fortunatus..... 214
V. — Dracontius.....

CHAPTER XVIII. — Boethius and Cassiodorus .
— Boethius.....
A. — Boethius and the treatise " De Consolatione Philosophiae "
B. — Boethius' other works. His influence .
II. — Cassiodorus 221
A. — Statesman
B. — Monk. Scholar

CHAPTER XIX. — Historians, Canonists and Ascetics 225-233
I. — Hagiography . 225
A. — Gennadius of Marseilles . 225
B. — The Liber pontificalis . 226
C. — Special Biographies . 227
II. — Histories and Chronicles. Travel books . 228
A. — Histories and Chronicles . 228
B. — Journeys to Palestine . 228
HL — Dionysius the Less . 229
IV. —St. Benedict and monastic legislation . 231

SECOND PART.

PATRISTIC LITERATURE FROM 553 TO 800.

CHAPTER I. — Saint Gregory the Great 234-253
I. — Life and Character . 235
II. — Works . 238
A. — Oratorical works . 239
B. — Moral works . 239
III. — St. Gregory's doctrine . 243
A. — The Doctor in general . 243
B. — Penitential discipline . 244
C. — Ascetic and mystical doctrine. . 245
D. — Pastoral teaching . 251

CHAPTER II. — Spanish Writers. Saint Isidore. 253-267
I. — Before S. Isidore. — St. Martin. — St. Leander . 253
A. — St. Martin of Braga, Apostle of the Suevi . 253
B. — St. Leander, Apostle of the Visigoths . 255
C. — Secondary authors . 257
II. — Saint Isidore of Seville . 258
A. — Life . 258
B. — Works of S. Isidore . 259
C. — St. Isidore's doctrine . 262
HI. — Other Spanish authors in the VHth century . 267

CHAPTER III. — The last Writers in Gaul and Great Britain . 268-278
I. —Saint Gregory of Tours . 268
II. — Saint Gildas the Wise . 272
III. — The Venerable Bede . 272
IV. —The Penitential books . 276

CONTENTS OF THE 2nd VOLUME.

CHAPTER IV. — Oriental Canonists, Hagiographers and Ascetics.....278-288

I. —Canonists.....278

A. — John 111, the Scholastic. The Nomocanons. . . 278

B. —John IV, the Faster. Penitential discipline . . . 280

II. —Historians and Hagiographers.....281

A. — Historians.....281

B. — Hagiographers..... 282

III. — Oriental ascetics..... . 284

A. — St. John Climacus.....284

B. — Other writers on spirituality — — — — — — 287

CHAPTER V. — Melodes and hymnographers . . 288-294

I. —Rhythmic poetry. Its origins.....288

II. —Saint Romanos.....289

III. — Saint Andrew of Crete. Authors of liturgical books . 292

A. — Saint Andrew of Crete..... 292

B. — Liturgical books..... . 293

CHAPTER VI. — Theologians of the Incarnation . 295-313

I. — Last adversaries of Monophysitism — — — — — 295

II. — Christological controversies in the VII th century . . 297

A. — Monothelitism.....297

B. — The condemnation. Attitude of Honorius . . . 301

HL — Saint Sophronius of Jerusalem..... 303

IV. — Saint Maximus the Confessor — — — — — . 306

A. — The Confessor or Martyr, and Theologian . . . 306

B. — The Ascetic and Mystic..... .310

CHAPTER VII. — The Defenders of the Worship of Ini ages in the East. Last Orators and Theologians 314-326

I. — The last of the Greek Orators — — — — — ' SM

II. — Theological controversies in the VII 1th century ' 316

A. — The worship of images..... ' 316

B. — Iconoclasm..... ' 317

HI. — The Patriarchs and the defence of images ' 321

A. — St. Germanus of Constantinople — — — ' 321

B. — Other defenders of the images — — — ' 323

IV. — Other Oriental theologians — — — — ' 324

CHAPTER VIII. — Saint John Damascene . 326-339

I. — Life of St. John Damascene. The defender of the images..... ' 326

CONTENTS OF THE 2nd VOLUME.

II. — Works of St. John Damascene . 330
A. — Theological works . 330
B. — Various other works . 332
III. — Doctrine . 334
A. — Doctor of the Incarnation . 334
B. — "Theology" . 335
C. — Grace, the Sacraments, the Church . 338

CHAPTER IX. — Saint Theodore of Studium .

I. — Life of St. Theodore. The monk. The defender of the images . 340
II. — Works . 343
III. — Doctrine . 345
A. — Ascetic doctrine .
B. — The venerationof images . 346
C. — The Apostolic See . 347

BOOK IV.

THE GREAT SUCCESSORS OF THE FATHERS.

(From the XIIth to the XVIth century).

Introduction . 351-373
I. — The Successors of the Fathers . 351
II. —Theology. Methods and Schools . 354
A. — Methods . 354
B. — Theological Schools . 356
III. — Teaching on the spiritual life . 359
A. — General notions . 359
B. — Asceticism and Mysticism . 361
C. — Diverse points of view . 364
IV. — General notes of a philosophical and literary nature . 366
A. — Philosophical notes . 366
B. — Literary notes . 368
V. — General Bibliography for Book IV . 370
A. — Works on ecclesiastical and religious literature . 371
B. — Works on Theology and the internal History of the Church . 372
C. — Works on philosophy, literature and Christian art. . 373

FIRST PART.

THE MIDDLE AGES.

CHAPTER I. — Remote Beginnings of Scholasticism 370-389
I. — The IXth century ' 375
A. — The Carolovingian renascence ' 375
B. — Theology in the IXth century. Chief controversies ' 376
C. — The most outstanding men in the IXth century ' 383
II. —The Xlth century ' 385
A. — Religious controversies ' 386
B. — Theology. Relation to Philosophy. ' 389
C. — Some famous ecclesiastical writers of the Xth and Xlth centuries ' 391
CHAPTER II. — Saint Anselm of Canterbury 394-412
I. — Life ' 394
II. —Works ' 397
A. — Christian philosophy ' 398
B. — Treatises on God ' 398
C. — Treatises on the Holy Trinity. ' 401
D. — Treatises on evil and the Redemption ' 401
E. — Various other writings ' 403
III. — The Doctor and his teaching ' 404
A. — The Doctor ' 404
B. — Teaching ' 407
CHAPTER III. — Abelard 413-421
I. — The intellectual environment in the XIIth century
II. —Peter Abelard ' 416
CHAPTER IV. — Saint Bernard 421-442
I. — Life of St. Bernard. His place in history ' 422
II. — Works ' 426
A. — Sermons ' 426
B. — Treatises ' 427
C. — Letters. Attributed works ' 429
III. — Doctrine ' 43°
A. — The Doctor ' 430
B. — St. Bernard's asceticism ' 433
C. — St. Bernard's mysticism ' 438
CHAPTER V. — The School of Saint Victor 442-456
I. Hugh of Saint Victor ' 442
A. — Theological works. Doctrine ' 443
B. — Spiritual works. Teaching ' 447
II. Richard of Saint Victor ' 450

CHAPTER VI. — Peter Lombard. The Summists . 457-469
I. — Peter Lombard . 457
II. —The Summists . 460
A. — Anonymous Summae . 460
B. — Authors of Summae . 462
III. — Diverse authors . 463
A. — Adversaries and defenders of dialectics . 463
B. — Controversialists and moralists . 465
C. — Theology and Canon Law . 467

CHAPTER VII. — Theology at the beginning of the XHIth century . 470-484
I. — Theology and the Universities . 470
II. —Theology and the philosophical movement in the XI11th century . 473
A. — The philosophy of the Augustinians . 473
B. — Arabian Aristotelianism . 476
C. — Various errors . 480
III, — Principal secular theologians . 481

CHAPTER VIII. — The First Theologians of the Mendicant Orders . 485-497
I. — Theology in the Mendicant Orders . 485
II. The first Dominican theologians . 487
A. — The Augustinians . 487
B. — St. Albert the Great . 488
III. — The first Franciscan theologians . 491
A. — Alexander of Hales . 491
B. — Other Parisian Masters . 494
C. — Independent authors . 495

CHAPER IX. — Saint Bonaventure . 497-526
I. — Life . 498
II. —Works . 501
A. — Exegetical works . 502
B. — Theological works . 502
C. — Oratorical works . 504
D. — Opuscula on spirituality or on the Franciscan Order . 504
III. — Doctrine . 506
A. — The Doctor . 506
B. — Philosophical teaching . 510
C. —Theology . 516
D. — Contemplative theology or mystical philosophy . 522

CHAPTER X. — Saint Thomas Aquinas 526-633
Special Bibliography 526
Article I. — Life of Saint Thomas 530
I. — St. Thomas' preparation for his mission 530
II. — Teaching at Paris 532
III. — The Theologian and the Roman Curia 536
IV. — Last years of teaching at Paris and Naples. Description of St. Thomas 538
Article II. — Works of St. Thomas (excepting the Summa theologica) 54|
I. — Philosophical Works 54|
A. — Commentaries on Aristotle 54|
B. — Original philosophical works 542
II. —Commentary of the IV Books of Sentences 543
III. — The Summa contra Gentiles 545
IV. —Disputed Questions and Quodlibetic Questions 546
A. — The De Veritate 546
B. — The De Potentia Dei 547
C. — The De Malo 547
D. — Other Quaestiones Disputatae 54&
E. — Quodlibetic Questions 54$
V. — Opuscula. Sermons 549
VI. — Scriptural works 552
Article III. — The Summa Theologica -554
I. General character 554
II. —Brief analysis 557
A. — Prima Pars 557
B. — Secunda Pars 560
C. — Tertia Pars 566
HI. — The uses of the Summa theologica 567
Article IV. — Doctrinal synthesis of Thomism 570
I. — Thomism 570
A. — Philosophical Thomism 570
B. — Thomist Theology 573
II. —Philosophical principles 577
A. — Intellectual knowledge 577
B. — Primary ideas. 579
C. — First determinations or divisions of Being .581
HL — God. The Trinity 585
A. — God. Existence of Nature ¡-g-
B. —The Blessed Trinitv kUiil

IV. — Creation. — Angels and men 592
A. — Creation and the government of created beings 592
B. — The Angels 594
C. — Man 595
V. — Thomist moral teaching 597
A. — General principles 597
B. — Application of general principles 605
VI. — Theology of Grace 607
A. — General theology of Grace 607
B. — Mystical theology 612
VII. —Ascetic theology 617
VIII. — The Redeemer and His work 621
A. — The Incarnation 621
B. — The Redemption 625
C. — The Virgin Mary. — The Mediatrix 627
D. — The Sacraments. — The Church 628
IX. — Beatitude 631
CHAPTER XI. — Theologians and Thomism in the XHth century 633-642
I. — The opposition to Thomism 633
II. —The Dominican Order and Thomism 635
III. — Other XIIIth century theologians 639
CHAPTER XII. — John Duns Scotus 642-661
I. — Life and Works 643
II. Theologian and Philosopher 646
A. — The Theologian 646
B. — Philosophical principles 649
HI. — The theology of Duns Scotus 652
A. — God. — Natural and Supernatural theology 652
B. — The Man-God. — Mary 655
C. — Man. — Grace. — Beatitude 658
CHAPTER XIII. — Theology in the XIVth century 661-690
I. —Decadence of Scholasticism. — Ockham. .661
A. — General decadence in the XIVth century 661
B. — Ockham 663
II. —Theological Schools 668
A. — Franciscans 668
B. — Dominicans 670
C. — Augustinians 672
D. — Other Religious Orders 674
E. — Seculars ^75

III. — Theology of the Church.....676
A. — Relations of Church and State.....676
B. — The central government of the Church — — — — 685

CHAPTER XIV. — Schools of Spirituality in the Middle Ages.....691-711
I. — Schools of Spirituality in general.....691
II. — Revival of the early Schools in the XIIth century . . 694
A. — Benedictine School. Cluny.....694
B. — Cistercian School.....696
C. — Augustinian School of Saint Victor. — — — — 697
III. — New Schools founded in the XHIth century . . . 699
A. — Franciscan School..... 699
B. — Dominican School.....701
IV. — The Dionysian School in the XIVth century . . . 702
A. — The great Dionysian School..... 7°2
B. — Moderate Dionysian School..... 7°5
V. — Schools at the end of the Middle Ages — — — — 7°6
A. — School of Windesheim.....7°6
B. — Carthusian School..... 7°8
C. — Doctrine of Gerson.....7°9

SECOND PART.

THE RENAISSANCE.

CHAPTER I. — The Renaissance and the Reformation. 712-727
I. — Humanism..... 712
II. —The Protestant Reformation . . . . «7*7
III. — The Catholic Reformation..... 723

CHAPTER II. — The Theological Revival in the XVIth century.....728-738
I. — Theologians of the early Schools.....728
II. — The Controversialists.....731
A. — In Germany.....732
B. — Outside Germany.....735

CHAPTER III. — Renaissance Dominican Theologians before the Council of Trent.....738-748
I. — Doctrinal life of the Order at the Renaissance . . 738
II. —Dominican theologians outside Spain — — — — 740
A. — Cajetan.....740
B. — Divers authors . .742
III. — The Spanish Dominicans. The early Thomist School at Salamanca.....744

CHAPTER IV. — The Thomist Theologians of Grace . 748-763

I. — Bannez and his school..... 7^8

II. — Augustinism and Thomism in the XVIth century controversies 751

III. — The various Augustinian schools 755

A. — Common Thomism . 755

B. — Augustinian Congruism . 759

C. — Augustinianism 762

CHAPTER V. — Jesuit Theologians in the XVIth century. Molinism..... 763-777

I. —Theology in the Society of Jesus • 763

II. —Jesuit theologians in the XVIth century . . 766

A. — Theology in general . 766

B. — Practical moral theology • 770

HI. — Molinism..... • 771

CHAPTER VI. — Francis Suarez . 778-790

I. — Life and Works of Suarez • 77S

II. — The philosophy of Suarez. His influence . 781

III. — Natural and supernatural theology . • 784

A. — God..... • 785

B. — Grace and the Sacraments . 786

C. — Christ and the Church. Moral and spiritual theology . 788

CHAPTER VII. — Spirituality at the Renaissance . 790-802

I. Various tendencies..... 790

II. — Early Schools (Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, Augustinians)..... 792

HI. — New Schools. Ascetism. The Ignatian School . . 794

CHAPTER VIII. — Saint Teresa . 802-824

I. — Life and Works..... . 802

A. — The Life of St. Teresa, written by herself . . 802

B. — Other works.....

II. — Spiritual Doctrine..... . 809

A. — General outline. The Saint's ascetic teaching . 809

B. — St. Teresa's mysticism in general . . 814

C. — Mystical graces that prepare the union .

D. — The first graces of union . 819

E. — The Transforming Union. Perfect divine friendship . 822

CHAPTER IX. — Saint John of the Cross . . . 824-840
I. — Life and Works.....825
II. — Mystical Doctrine.....830
A. — The point of view of St. John of the Cross . . . 830
B. — Characteristic points of the doctrine 834

CHAPTER X. — Saint Francis of Sales _ _ _ _ 841-860
I. — Life and Works.....841
IL — Spiritual doctrine.....847
A. — Theoretical foundations of Salesian spirituality . . 847
B. — Salesian devotion and asceticism.....850
C. — The love of God and Salesian mysticism . . . 856

Conclusion.....861-868

INDEXES.

Alphabetical index of authors' names . 869-882
Doctrinal Index..... 883-916
I. — General data for the introduction to Theology . 883
A. — Preliminary definitions _ _ _ _ . 883
B. — Philosophy..... . 885
C. — Holy Scripture..... . 887
D. — Tradition..... . 888
E. — Apologetics and Controversy . . 890
F. — Doctrinal errors combated by the Fathers . 891
II. — Patristic data concerning the Faith (Dogma) . 893
A. — God, His Nature and His work • 893
B. — The Trinity..... . 895
C. — Christ. Our Lady. The Saints . 896
D. — Grace..... • 899
E. — The Sacraments _ _ _ _ _ . 901
F. — The Church..... • 903
G. — The Last Things..... • 905
III. — Patristic data concerning Christian Life . . 906
A. — Moral Theology..... . 906
B. — Spiritual Life..... • 909
C. — Pastoral. Discipline _ _ _ _ . 912
IV. —Alphabetical Index to the Doctrinal Index . 9!3

BOOK III

The End of Patristic Literature

(Third period : 430-800)

INTRODUCTION.

I. GENERAL OUTLINE. DIVISION.

The year 430, which saw the death of Saint Augustine, the great Doctor of the West, and which marks the beginning of the Christological controversies, sources of bitter quarrels and division among most of the Eastern Churches for many hundreds of years, definitely initiates this new and final period of Patristic literature. It is more difficult to determine the end of the period. Some authors, dealing with the West, hardly go beyond Saint Gregory the Great, at the beginning of the seventh century. We think, however, that the period may be extended to the opening of the eighth century, if we take into account Saint Bede, who, for reasons which do not seem altogether justifiable, is not usually included in works on Patrology. As for the East, in spite of the current practice of coming to an end with Saint John Damascene, it would seem preferable to go as far as the beginning of the ninth century, in order to include the end of the Iconoclast controversy and the outstanding Catholic Doctor, Theodore of Studium. In this manner all the orthodox Christian literature of the early Church will be covered; and it is this which may be properly said to constitute the Patristic epoch L

This long period, extending over many centuries, will be divided into *two parts* according to the doctrinal questions which formed the chief preoccupations of the authors studied.

' Sec Vol. I, *Introduction*, p. 1-3.

The 1st Part extends over the period which separates the Council of Ephesus (431) from the second Council of Constantinople(553). From adoctrina! viewpoint it is characterised *in the West* by the Semipelagian controversies on the gratuity of grace and predestination, and, *in the East,* by the appearance of Monophysitism and Nestorianism; two chief errors which led the Church and the Doctors to proclaim the truth on the essential points of Christology : the unity of the Person and the duality of natures.

There is less unity in the Ilnd Part. *In the East,* the controversial spirit was fed by two new errors, Monothelitism (VIth cent) and Iconoclasm (VUIth and beginning of the (IXth cent.). Although these heresies were of an official and almost artificial nature, and in spite of the many practical problems of the period, there was no lack of true theologians and great works on the side of truth. *In the West,* the authors are few; but although they showed but little originality of thought, each in his own country played an important part : they transmitted the doctrinal wealth of the past to the new peoples and thus laid the foundations of the splendid literary revival of the Middle Ages. The distinction we draw between Patristic literature in the *East* and in the *West* is founded, even more than in the past, on notable differences of subject and purpose as well as of language. Too much stress, however, must not be laid on these divergences, for there is a risk of exaggerating the diverse tendencies manifested on both sides and of forgetting the real unity which bound together the writers of these times in a common attachment to the traditional faith, in devotion to the Church and submission to its one Mead, the Bishop of Rome. This last point is of immense importance: in no other epoch of the history of the Church has pontifical authority been so solemnly affirmed and recognised as in the great Councils of this period, especially those of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Right up to the eve of the schism, and in spite of far too long temporary divisions, both in the East and in the West, eloquent voices were raised to recall and affirm the traditional truth that the See of Peter is the Apostolic See and the centre of unity. Further, as regards this point and others, it must not be forgotten how much the writers of this period were influenced by their social environment.

II. THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT.

A) The East.

The Roman Empire, divided in practice from the end of the fourth century, still appeared to maintain its sway in the East, while in the West, in the fifth century, it was irrevocably given up to the Barbarians. It would be a mistake, however, to overlook the profound changes it underwent even in the East. There was first the gradual shrinking of its frontiers. *Tozvards the Danube,* in spite of the continually renewed hordes of barbarian invaders, first Goths, then Slavs and Bulgarians, the Empire was able, over a long period, to maintain a more or less nominal sovereignty in the majority of these countries. The danger was more serious *towards the south-east:* there, "entire provinces, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, and other regions were only superficially Greek. There, outside the cities, especially the maritime cities, the great mass of the people remained alien to Greek influence, ignorant of its language, hostile to its action, jealous of its domination; above all desirous of breaking the bonds which bound them to the young and improvised capital on the Bosphorus. As long as the Empire retained its prestige, these embittered races smothered their patriotism. When the Empire began to fall they tried to throw off the yoke. They had recourse to indirect means. They turned to their use Nestorianism, Monophysitism and Monothelitism, much as the conquering peoples on the Danube and in the West, Burgundians, Vandals and Goths had employed Arianism. In reality, in spite of the religious pretexts that were put forward, their doctrinal rupture hid only a patriotic manoeuvre in quest of vengeance and political secession" [1]. Moreover, in this movement for political independence they were supported, in the fifth and sixth centuries, in the regions of Armenia and Syria, by their powerful neighbours, the Persians, whose power was reaching out day by day towards the long desired sea, the Mediterranean. All these movements paved the way for Arab and Mohammedan domination, which in the seventh century spread like a powder train over the whole of the East, tearing away from ancient "Romania" its finest provinces and threatening the Emperor even in his capital.

1 J. Pargoire, *I?Eglise Byzantine,* p. 2-3.

The ancient Empire of the East, hellenised, transformed, and finally broken up, thus became the Byzantine Empire. This Empire was not indeed without merits;[1] it had truly great princes, knew its days of glory, and in particular had the honour of curbing Islam for centuries, until the decline it suffered in the Middle Ages. From the religious standpoint which is our special interest, it possesses well-marked characteristics. Christianity occupies a very wide, almost a universal place, but the part it plays is subservient, consisting of a state of servility unworthy of it. The Church of course should never dominate or take the place of the secular power, but neither should it, under pain of failing in its misson, become but a cog in the State, a kind of administrative organ to be used at the whim of the prince and his ministers. Such was, on the whole, the *Byzantine Church,* It represented at that time only a part of the early Greek Church[2], a diminished and servile Greek Church. The dominating tendencies which had been manifested in the Christian Empire from the fourth century were continued and intensified at Byzantium[3]. Justinian especially embodied in his person "the ideal of the Emperor Pontiff", says Father Pargoire, but he himself had models in his predecessors and still more imitators in those who came after him.

This religious policy, which bound together all too tightly the Church and the State, was not long in bringing forth bitter fruit. The separation of the outlying provinces was justified by the too official and Greek nature ol Byzantine Christianity. On the other hand, " the swarm of heresies must be traced chiefly to the same cause. Court Christianity could not be other than inconstant and as diverse as its masters" [4]. In the end, Christian unity found itself seriously imperilled. These far too close links with the temporal order caused those who were not guided by a profound Christian instinct and permanent contact with tradition, to forget the religious principles on which is founded the authority of the See which is the centre of unity. To such minds, Rome must have seemed less a mother whose guidance is accepted with

[1] There are insufficient grounds for the misleading sense given to the term, itself inaccurate, of *Late Empire.*

[2] The Greek Church originally signified the whole of the Christian East, before the institution of diverse national Churches. See J. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* p. 6. — [3] See Vol. I, p. 291-294.

[4] J. Pargoire. *op. fit.,* p. S.

respectful docility, than a rival whose privileges[1] are at first contested before being denied and combated.

In such an atmosphere it was natural that conflicts and ruptures should multiply, nor did they fail to do so. It is nevertheless remarkable that in spite of all the forces launched against her, the early faith in the supreme authority of the Roman Church lived on at Byzantium, and there is nothing better calculated to prove the traditional firmness of this doctrine. In the sixth century, the century of Justinian (527-565), "the magisterium (of the Roman Pontiff) and his authority "[2], says Pargoire, " were so widely recognised, and consecrated to such an extent by tradition, that [the Emperors] did not even dream of contesting them, though in practice they were ready to override them when they came athwart their interests, their whims or their pride". It was the same later : " Eastern Christianity in the seventh century, like that of preceding centuries, continued to bow down before the successors of Saint Peter, and we need onlv listen to hear its most accredited representatives loudly proclaim the supremacy of the Roman See "[3]. In the following century and until the time of Photius, " in spite of the advance of Cæsaropapism, the East still knew what was the constitution of the Church, and the saints of Byzantium and its Doctors never ceased to salute the supreme chief of souls in the person of the Sovereign Pontiff" [4]. Some of these great witnesses to tradition in the East will be heard in the following pages.

B). The West

From this standpoint of unity the situation of the Western Church was much more favourable. The successor of Peter dwelt in the midst of the Latin countries, while on the other hand the premature fall of the Empire radically destroyed any obstacles which a too distrustful official protection might have raised. Moreover, amid the heaped-up ruins of the Empire the Church appeared to the bewildered ancient peoples as the only stable force to have outlived the universal cataclysm, whilst in the common interest she lent her moral support to the new sovereigns and their peoples. Thus, in

1 All the more, since after Justinian, Rome was politically dependent on Byzantium. — 2 J. Pargoire, *op. cit.*, p. 44.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 189.
4 *Ibid.*, p. 289-290.

the persons of her bishops she showed herself, in practice as well as in theory, as a true power; spiritual, it is true, but endowed with a superior personal vitality, independent of established powers. The part played by these men, subjects of the State, and yet in a certain fashion independent of it, was immense. Still greater was that of the Popes, whose prestige, far from being hindered as it was in the East, was on the contrary augmented by external circumstances. The high personal value of some, such as Saint Gregory the Great, added to it a still more precious brilliance.

The West in fact suffered more from invasions than did the East. From the beginning of the fifth century the Barbarians were pouring in, even before the disappearance of the Imperial power, which, however, was nominal rather than effective. Nevertheless the ancient civilisation did not disappear everywhere at the same time. There were even periods of prosperity ; in *Italy,* for instance, under the glorious reign of Theodoric (496-526), king of the Ostrogoths, in spite of his Arianism. In *Africa* the Arian Vandals, masters of the country since 430, were not so tolerant, particularly at the end of the fifth century; but they were unable to smother all Catholic voices, notably that of Saint Fulgentius. The re-establishment of Imperial and Byzantine authority over these two countries in the time of Justinian gave them an uneasy peace only for a time. *Gaul,* which at that time was perhaps the most cultured part of the Empire, also displayed a great literary activity during the first part of the period now in question. The kingdom of the Francs — the first Catholic kingdom to be founded by the Barbarians — did not succeed at the time in bringing peaceful enough conditions for the maintenance and the progress of this intellectual activity. Later, however, under Charlemagne, it was again the first to cultivate the sciences and the arts, and thus remotely prepare the great scholastic flourishing of the Middle Ages. *Spain,* at first profoundly perturbed by the Barbarian invasions, found at length in the seventh century, after the conversion of the Visigoths and before the coming of the Arabs, a century of peace, which brought forth a number of intellectual works, some of which are outstanding. On the whole, however, after the seventh century the gloom begins to thicken in the West and the Church itself found itself enveloped within it.

III. LITERARY WORKS. DOCTRINE.

A) Traits in Common.

In this last period of Patristic literature practical works and compilations appear in an ever increasing number, Commentaries in the form of *Chains* (passages placed one after the other, selected from early commentators, on various Scriptural texts that were to be explained) continued to multiply by the side of theological florilegia and anthologies [1]. Similarly, moral, ascetic and disciplinary works took on a considerable development, as well as religious poetry and chronicles, which replaced history in the proper sense of the word. Such tendencies are to be remarked both in the East and in the West. These literary fashions are explained by the nature of the times we have just described, and in addition by the need of the Church to control directly the education of the new peoples; for their sake the work of the Fathers and the theologians of previous centuries were set out in concise and simple forms.

Another character of a doctrinal nature, common both to the authors of the East and the West, is the importance they gave to the authority of the Fathers in theological matters [2]. Already in the sixth century great bishops were appealing not only to the authority of the Scriptures and Tradition in general[3], but to that of the earlier Doctors [4]. This practice was strengthened in the fifth century, chiefly by the fact of the fame of the great Fathers who flourished in the fourth century. Not only were the Fathers quoted, but the theory of the proof from authority, founded on their witness, was developed, in the East and still more in the West. The Fathers were indeed invoked with confidence, as witness the number of quotations[5], but not without discretion. In the

1 Sec for instance the extracts from St. Angustine's works made by St. Prosper (p. 185). To these may be compared the *collections of Scriptural texts* especially compiled to prove a point of doctrine: thus the *De recta fide ad reginas* of St. Cyril (see p. 26), of which the greater part consists of a series of texts against the Nestorians; similarly the *Disputatio,* between St. Maximus and Pyrrhus. They are often accompanied by *collections of Patristic texts.*

2 See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Do°m.,* III, p. 7-S, 327-330.

3 See Vol. I. *Doctrinal Index*, n. 17.

4 Thus St. Augustine in the *Contra /ulianum,* bk. I *{passim)* ; St. Athanasius in *De Dionysii sententia;* St. Basil, etc.

5 See for instance the works of St. Cæsarius, or the Decree of the Council of the Lateran (694) against the Monothelites, of which the first eleven canons open thus: "Si quis, *secundum Sanctos Patres,* non confitetur, . . ."

Decree of Gelasius [1] we already find a series of doubtful authors, together with those approved by the Church; Saint Vincent of Lerins also teaches that all the Fathers have not the same authority; he adds, moreover, this valuable observation that the teaching of a Doctor, no matter how holy and learned, cannot be admitted as certain if it is contrary to, or even divergent from, the common teaching of the other Fathers [2]. Lastly, *Patristic collections* were formed, in which the theologians, whose duty it was to defend the faith on points that were attacked, were able to find their arms ready to hand [3].

The West and the East, in agreement on these points, were divergent on others, even in doctrinal matters.

B) The West.

Saint Augustine is the almost exclusive source of religious learning in the Latin world. "During this period, darkened by the Barbarian invasion and charged with the duty of safeguarding the theological learning of the future, it may truly be said that Augustine is the great master of the West: he is absolutely without rival, for should he have one, it is one of his own disciples. Saint Gregory the Great, who, educated at his school and penetrated with his spirit, popularised, one may say vulgarised, his principal theories. This preponderating influence of Augustine is the special character of this period, until the coming of the Aristotelian philosophy" [4]. It was also through him that the *Platonist philosophy* found its way to the West; it is true that it scarcely developed until the eve of the Middle Ages, at the end of the Patristic epoch of which we treat here. Philosophers, moralists, orators, the numerous and meritorious compilers, and especially the theologians, all drew on the immense work of the Bishop of Hippo, as if it were an inexhaustible fountain head.

The Augustinian teaching on grace continued to attract attention. The Semipelagians, who had attacked it before the death of the saint, accentuated their resistance, chiefly in Gaul, when he was no longer there to defend himself. But faithful friends, supported by Rome, were able to answer his

1 See Vol. I, p. 514 (n. 5). — * *Commonitorium,* 28. See below, p. 168.
3 See above, p. 7, n. I.
4 E. PORTALIÉ, *Augustinisme,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 2501.

aggressors and finally achieved a triumph for his teaching at Orange (528) in a modified form, but which nevertheless retained his essential principles and the position he had taken up ». This was the chief Western controversy of the period. The fight against the *Arianism* of the Barbarians gave rise to the composition of several works, but these had but little originality. The *Christological question* caused little stir in the Latin world, except perhaps at the time of the condemnation of the Three Chapters. It went to far greater lengths in the East.

C) The East.

The religious literature of the time is in great measure theological, and has Christ for its chief subject. The diverging tendencies of the Schools of Antioch and Alexandria[1] were destined to end in exaggeration and produce two serious heresies, opposed one to the other: Nestorianism and Monophysitism. Each party admitted the divinity of Christ; but at Antioch His humanity was stressed to such an extent that there resulted the affirmation of a real dual personality : such was the *Nestorian error*[*] already taught by Theodore of Mopsuestia. At Alexandria, on the contrary, Christ's divinity was thrown into such relief that His humanity appeared to be neglected or even suppressed. This resulted in a physical unitarianism, from which Saint Cyril's pseudo-disciples drew their *Monophysitism*. The Popes, especially Saint Leo, who from the very outset had condemned the new heresies and proclaimed the true doctrine, were nevertheless unable to cut short the controversies, and these interminable discussions, after having vexed the East during the fifth and sixth centuries, ended by dividing it.

Two other heresies troubled the Church during the last years of the Patristic age: *Monothelitism* in the seventh century and *Iconoclasm* in the eighth. But the outstanding features of these errors were their character of official doctrines, imposed by the Court theologians for political ends. The paltry purposes of these controversalists so often aroused their ignoble passions that they were unable to deal adequately with the subjects in question. Some men were found, however, capable of surmounting purely human

1 See below, St. Caesarius, p. 204.
3 See Vol. I, p. 298-299.

affairs, and of rising to the principles that throw light on the mysteries themselves.

The results of these controversies were valuable. In the first, the relations of the divine and human natures in Christ were established with all possible clarity. From a theological point of view the discussions were virtually closed the day when Leontius Byzantinus, following in the footsteps of the Cappadocians, at last gave a complete definition of the Person, even more complete than that of Boethius. The defenders of *Christ's human will* had only to deduce the consequences of the principles that had been formulated, and, at the same time, insist on the constant moral union of this will with God's. They were thus led, Saint Maximus in particular, to place the Man-God in the centre of their spirituality as well as their theology, in order to show that the great and only means of sanctification is the imitation of Christ.

Finally, those who *defended the use of images,* widening the ground of the debate, as did Saint John Damascene, were wise enough to link up this question with the study of the part played by rites and sensible objects in the work of our salvation and sanctification, or like Saint Theodore of Studium, going right to the cause of the general uneasiness from which the East was suffering, they denounced the sacrilegious encroachment of the State on religious affairs and openly declared the general rights of the Church in the spiritual domain.

Since a great number of the difficulties raised by the Christological questions resulted from differences of terminology, since certain philosophical terms had not yet been sufficiently defined in special cases then in question, a general note on this point will be added to this Introduction for the reader's guidance in the study of the various authors.

IV. TERMINOLOGY OF THE GREEK FATHERS IN THE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES[1].

In the fourth century the Trinitarian question, although not a simple matter of terminology as many have heedlessly

[1] See A. Michel - *Hypostase,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 369-407. J. Tixeront, *concepts de "nature" et de "personne" dans les Pères et les écrivains ecclésiastiques des I' et ΓB siècles,* in *Mélanges,* p. 2IO-227. M. JUGIE, *Nestorius et controverse nestorienne,* p. 174-190. Dom Chapman, in *Rev. bénéd.,* 1914, P· 194'197· V. Grumel, *Léonce de Byzance,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 403-40S.

affirmed, was greatly aggravated by the different meanings given to the words ουσία and ὑπόστασι . From the fifth century the Christological question was similarly confused; it too was primarily a doctrinal question but was rendered unnecessarily obscure by terms used in different senses and the vagueness of certain concepts that were all important to the subject. We mean the words ουσία, «ὐσι , υπόσταση. , πρόσωπον.

The precision of terms which resulted from the *Trinitarian controversies* had hardly as yet been applied to the Incarnation. They dealt chiefly with the *person,* of which the real character had been demonstrated against the Modalists, even to the extent of calling it hypostasis (ὑπόστασ.), yet it had also been distinguished from the essence (ουσία) or substance, which in God remains one and common, in spite of the multiplicity of hypostases \ Thus the chief aim had been to define the hypostasis in its relations with the essence. Such data were insufficient—or, at least, did not suffice in practice—for the solution of the Christological problem, concerning the relations of the *person* with the *nature,* φὐσ^ . It is of paramount importance, then, to give a precise meaning to this latter word. To achieve this, however, it is first necessary to indicate the exact sense of the other formulas as they gradually came to be determined in the great controversies. This general outline will aid the student in following their development and in understanding the exact position adopted by each of the Fathers.

A). The word ουσία (essentia), taken in its strict meaning, signifies the abstract *specific essence* of any being. It is therefore to distinguished from the φὐσι (natura), which signifies the individual nature of a being. This latter word, however, as will be seen, is often taken in the sense of ουσία. With regard to Christ's human nature, which is an individual and created reality, the Fathers prefer to speak of *nature,* whilst in the Trinitarian debates they usually employed the word ουσία, essence or substance.

B). The word φὐσι (natura) has a much more complex meaning.

I. Its first, natural and immediate sense is that of an *individual* and concrete *nature;* it is the essence as having

' See Vol. I, p. 434'437·

reality in beings in which it is considered as the principle of operation.

2. Often enough, however, φύσι takes nearly the meaning of ουσία:

a) When *God,* whose nature is essentially one, is spoken of; also in the study of the Trinity (in theology, as was sometimes said) these words were taken for each other, although ουσία, was the more usual ;

b) When it means *the sum* of inviduals of the species, rather than one individual in particular. But even in this case, φυσι cannot be confused absolutely with οὐσία, which designates the essence or the species as such.

3. Further, φύσι sometimes takes the meaning of *person.* This divergency of expression derives both from the vagueness of the concept of person in many of the Fathers, and from the concrete standpoint from which they usually envisage it, as will be seen below. It must be noted, however, that this sense is given to φύσι only in Christological matters and never in Trinitarian theology; after the Arian controversies the distinction of the persons (hypostases) in God had become well defined.

C) The hypostasis, ὑπόστασι .—Here the question of the word is complicated by a vagueness of thought, and both the word and the idea are ruled by the viewpoint which dominated Oriental speculation in these matters.

I. The person was thus considered in its *most concrete aspect:* it is the " first substance" as Aristotle and the Scholastics say; it is a being possessing all the attributes of complete, reasonable and autonomous nature x. Such a being is obviously more than an accident; it is a substance, it has a complete nature; it is, in a way, a nature. Each person is ωὐσ·. . Thus their concrete point of view led the Greek Fathers to throw into relief all that brings the person nearer to the nature, rather than to distinguish them. The term *hypostasis,* ὑπβστασι , which by its origin signifies *substance,* corresponds very well to this realist conception of personality.

' As has been said previously (Vol. I, p. 434), the Cappadocians had been careful to note that the character proper to the hypostasis is the existence *in se* of a substantial l>eing. Perhaps in an even greater measure than St. Basil, St Gregory of Naz. ‘‘insists on the concepts of totality, independence and intelligence as characterising the person ", says Tixeront, *Mélanges,* p. 212. See *Otalio.* XXXiii, 16. But St. Gregory of Nyssa adds to it the idea of spontaneity and liljerty *{Oratio Catech.,2),* which form a part of the moral and juridical concept of personality rather than of the metaphysical concept, which alone is in question here. Apollinaris includes the notion of intelligence in the same sense, and his error began from there.]

2. Does it follow that every φύσι is a hypostasis from the fact that every hypostasis is φύσι? Leontius Byzantinus explained in the sixth century that every φύσι *is not* ὑπόστασι, but that every φύσι *has* a hypostasis. The accident alone is ανυπόστατο; but between the ανυπόστατο and the ὑπόστασι there is room for a middle term, the ἐνυποστατο or *-purely individual substance* which has not its own existence and which exists by, or in, another hypostasis. These distinctions suppose the idea of an abstract hypostasis or of that *subsistence* which is the formal constitutive element of a person, that is to say, existence *in se* of the complete nature.

3. This notion, implied in the doctrinal formulas of the Fathers previous to Leontius, and especially after the Cappadocians, had, however, hardly been rendered explicit enough until then. The established data regarding the Divine Persons had not been generalised, which proves that their universal character had not been sufficiently understood. The constitutive element of the person remained associated with other less essential elements'; hence a vague and varying terminology. Even *Saint Cyril,* says 'Fixeront2, does not seem to have been quite clear; he did not succeed in finding expressions limpid enough to exclude all ambiguity. His concrete point of view made the task too difficult. He did not, however, fall into error, for he allowed himself to be guided by a very sure theological instinct rather than by philosophical conceptions. Moreover, as regards the point of traditional doctrine which was especially threatened in his time, he put up a powerful and invincible defence.

4. The point of view adopted by Saint Cyril and those who came after him really possessed considerable advantages. Just as the adoption of the word, "hypostasis", in Trinitarian theology had, in the previous century, effectively safeguarded the real character of the Divine Persons 3, so the concrete viewpoint under which the person or the hypostasis in Christology was considered permitted a strong affirmation of its real and essential unity *{physical,* as it was called). But the disadvantages of this method are obvious. The same term φύσι or ὑπόστασι, signified: 1) sometimes the *nature* properly so called, when the nature *possessed* by the subject is considered, rather than the nature itself; 2) sometimes the *person* when the nature was considered, *inasmuch* as it is possessed and possessing, that is, in reality, the subject which possesses it.

5. A real doctrinal danger resulted from such imprecision, which led to opposed and perhaps contradictory theological formulas: at Antioch it was said that there were two natures in Christ; while at Alexandria they said there was but one "nature". Such divergent views necessarily engendered a mutual misunderstanding, and, what was more serious, quickly led to error.—As is obvious, philosophy failed to supply sufficient guidance for the avoidance of the latter. But the Fathers, and notably Saint Cyril, did not rely on philosophy. Their ideas were primarily guided by their faith, tradition, and Christian and

1 See the preceding note. — a *Mélanges,* p. 216-217.

3 The defenders of the common ουσία (ὁμοούσιο) had also strenuously maintained another truth, no less fundamental, that of the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, against the Arians.

Catholic instinct. It is not of course impossible that those who refused to submit to the decisions of the Councils, speaking in the name of tradition, may not in practice have been free from error on this particular point of Christology ; but *a priori* there are strong grounds for suspecting their orthodoxy, the proof of which is no easy task.

6. There were errors on both sides. In the *Antiochian groups* in which the meaning of hypostasis was freely reduced to that of nature (φὐσι), are found truly orthodox doctors together with Nestorians who taught a rigid hypostatic duality. In the *Alexandrian group* which followed Cyril, and which tended to reduce the concept of "nature" (φὐσι) to that of hypostasis (person), are found pre-eminently orthodox teachers, such as Saint Cyril, by the side of rigid Monophysists like Eutyches and very dubious adversaries of the Council of Chalcedon, such as the Severians.

D) The word ποὸσωπον.—In Trinitarian theology after the fourth century this word is synonymous with hypostasis or person. In Christology it also signifies person, but with shades of difference which must be noted.

1. For the Alexandrians (Saint Cyril and his School), who here insist on the concept of *person* [1]*to the extent of connecting it with that of nature (for this School, ὐ-οστασι and φὐσι may be translated as *substantial personality)* prosopon is more often than not synonymous with hypostasis and in a certain measure also of φὐσι [3]. For Saint Cyril this word has never the wider sense of personality or moral person.

2. Among the Antiochians, who had a marked Dyophysite tendency, since they chiefly insisted on the concept of nature to the extent of reducing that of *hypostasis* to it (here φὐσι and ὐ-ὸστασι may be translated *as substantial nature**)^ the word prosopon is opposed to hypostasis and signifies the *person* possessing the nature[4]. Moreover, this concept of person, more or less bound up with that of nature, was hardly current at Antioch. Its true reality[5], however, was maintained by the Catholics ; but the Nestorians thought of it as purely moral and accidental. The word, *prosopon,* thus meant for the latter, " personality" in a wide sense, rather than the physical person ; and it is possible that prosopon has no other meaning in Nestorius' expression, *physical prosopon;* in any case such was the sense of the formula *prosopon of union,* which was so dear to him [6].

[1] This is explained by the theological preoccupations of the Alexandrians who tended to stress the Divinity of Christ Who not only possesses the divine nature but Who is also a Divine Person, a hypostasis in the proper sense of the word.

[3] See A. Michel, *op. di.,* col. 3S8. M. Jugie, *op. cil.,* p. 174-190.

[3] In order to show their devotion to Christ's humanity and to mark its integrity against the Apollinarists they called it *hypostasis,* in a sense very near to that of nature but with a tendency to reduce to a minimum the real content of the concept oí person, so as not to diminish the substantial nature.

♦ Fr. Jugie, however, considers that also at Antioch, at least for Nestorius, φὐσι , ὑπὸστασι and πρὸσωιτον are synonymous and directly signify the person. See below, p. 18-19.

[5] Without seeing clearly enough perhaps its substantial and physical character ; hence their opposition to the formulas of St. Cyril's School. — [6] See below, p. 18-19.

FIRST PART

PATRISTIC LITERATURE

From 430 to 553

FIRST SECTION

CHAPTER I.

Nestorius [1]

A native of Germanicia (Marash), Nestorius was educated at Antioch, where he entered the religious life in the monastery of Euprepios, which was situated in the neighbourhood of that town. After he had been ordained priest, he showed such a talent for preaching, that the Emperor called him to the See of Constantinople in 428. At the beginning of his episcopate, his great zeal in combating the Arians and the Novatians seemed to indicate that the new Bishop of the Byzantine capital was destined to become a vigorous defender of orthodoxy [2]. But even before the end of the year 428 Nestorius compromised himself by making a stand against the expression, then popular at Constantinople, of Θεοτόκο , as applied to Mary [3]

Anastasias, one of the priests he had brought with him, had in fact caused a real scandal by forbidding the use of this title. Nestorius, instead of blaming him, undertook his public defence in a series of sermons preached in connection with the affair. Procius [4], the Bishop of Cyzicus, resisted

[1] Special bibliography: F. Nau, *Nestorius d'après les sources orientales,* Paris, 1911. M. Jugie, *Nestorius et la controverse neslorienne,* Paris, 1912. J. Tixeront, *Nisi. Dog/n.,* in, p. 23-35. A. Michel, *Hypostatique (Union),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 471-477. — [2] See M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 19-28.

[3] Theodore of Mopsuestia had already combated this expression at Antioch, but had been obliged to retract. See Vol. I. p. 456.

[4] The Nestorian error had already been previously denounced by the lawyer Eusebius, who, when he became Bishop of Dorylocum, denounced Eutyches to the permanent synod in 448.

him, but was unable to bring him to see reason. It was then that Saint Cyril, who had been informed of the affair, entered into the lists and had the heresiarch condemned at Ephesus (431) L After his deposition, Nestorius first withdrew to the monastery of Eu propios. The Emperor forbade the publication of his writings and soon afterwards was forced to send him into exile at Petra in Arabia (435). Later, before 445, he had him transferred to the Oasis of Egypt. It was here, a few years before his death, which occurred about the beginning of 451, that he published the *Liber Heraclidis,* a tardy defence, which succeeded, thanks to a pseudonym, in escaping the imperial censorship.

The Book of Heraclides is Nestorius' only complete treatise to have survived, and it was not edited until the beginning of the twentieth century from a Syriac version[1]. Its authenticity, moreover, has not been definitely established, at least as regards the present state of the work[3].

Other ofNestorius' writings are still extant, however[4]; these are :

1. Fragments of the *Tragedy*[5], a history of the origins of the Christological controversies and the Council of Ephesus.

2. Fragments of *Theof)aschite*\ a dialogue between one of Nestorius' followers and one of Saint Cyril's disciples, accused of Theopaschite Monophysitism [7].

3. Twelve propositions of anathema against those of Saint Cyril[8].

4. Ten *letters* (of which 3 to St. Celestine; 2 to St. Cyril) and fragments of others

5. Of his innumerable *homilies* (“infiniti tractatus”, says Gennadius) there remain only fragments of about thirty and the almost complete text of four[9].

These extant remains of Nestorius' work enable us to gather a fair idea of his teaching, while, in addition, the early

1 See the following Chapter, p. 26 sq.

2 P. Bedjan, *Le Livre it"Héraclicte de Damas* (Syriac text), Paris, 1910; Fr. trans, by F. Nau, Paris, 1910.

3 J. Lebon is against its authenticity: *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1911, p. 513-519. See also M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 71-77.

4 After having been scattered for a long time (in Migne, Mansi, etc.) they have now been brought together by A. Loot's, *Nestoriana,* Halle, 1905. See also J. Lebon, *Musèo»,* 1929, p. 46-75.

5 There is another history of Ephesus, also entitled *Tragedy,* written by Count Irenaeus, a friend of Nestorius and future Bishop of Tyre. See p. 114.

û Written at Eupropios, from 421 to 435.

7 See below, p. 58.

6 Massi, *Cotteti.,* v, 703-706, or *P. L.,* 48, (M. Mercator), col, 909-923.

' See M. Jugie, *op. at.,* p. 82-89. Mgr Batiffol attributed to Nestorius *(Rev. Bibl.,* 1900, t. xi, p. 329-353) 52 other sermons whose authenticity remains very doubtful.

refutations of the heretic from the pens of his contemporaries provide useful information which leaves no doubt as to his heterodoxy. An attempt was made to rehabilitate him after the recent discovery [1] of the *Book of Heraclides*. But this work, even should it be authentic, does not justify such a favourable judgment [2].

Nestorius' teaching,[3] more complex than that of Theodore of Mopsuestia[4] may be summed up as follows:

1. There are two natures in Christ, which remain distinct; each is complete and retains the powers according to which it acts. Such is the truly Antiochian introduction to the whole of this theory.

2. Though both God and man, Christ is nevertheless one; He is a Person, εν πρόσωπον; He has in himself a single prosopon, pLOVaòtxov προσωπον. But it must be noted that to Nestorius' mind the *unity* is conceived as the *result of the union* [5] instead of existing "in spite of" the union [6], thanks to the previously existing person of the Word Who assumes the human nature. Therefore he denies that the prosopon of Christ is identical with the prosopon of the Word, and refuses to admit any *communication of idioms*[7], in the strict sense of the word, notably the title of Θεοτόκο given to Mary. Further, in Christ the man is not the Son of God by nature;[8] but only "by homonymy with the Son [9]", the Word Who alone is absolutely the Son of God [10]. It is easily seen from this how shallow is the unity Nestorius theoretically affirmed.

3. This superficial character of the unity of Christ becomes even more obvious when we observe what manner

1 See chiefly F. Bethune Baker, *Nestorius and his teaching,* Cambridge, 1908. Fendt, *Die. Christologie des Nestorius.* Kempten, 1910. A 19th century Calvinist, J. Breguier, had already attempted a similar rehabilitation, and was refuted by Petau, *De Incarnatione*, Book IV.

2 See M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* in which the recent apologists of Nestorius are refuted.

3 Nestorius was less violently Nestorian than Theodore, says J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 35. See Vol. 1, p. 447-448.

4 See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm,,* III, p. 24 sq.

5 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Doçm.,* in, p. 28.

6 That is to say in spite of the plurality supposed by any union.

7 The communication of idioms (characters or properties) is the predication, in Christ, of the properties of the Divine Nature to the man, and of the properties of the human nature to God.

8 Φύσει και αληθώ . Loofs, *op. cit.,* p. 217.

9 'Ο δέόμωνύμω τώ υΐψ υιό . *Ibid.* Homonymy means a mere appellation.

10 Ιίρουγουυ.ενω και καθ' έαυτόν. *Ibid.*

of *union* Nestorius establishes between the man and God. He refuses to admit union *secundum essentiam* or *secundum hypostasim* [1], in order to exclude any such union as that of the body and the soul in man; in this sense he was right[2], but only in this sense. He usually calls the union *conjunctio* [3], a word which means a binding or a placing together, resulting from pure complaisance on the part of the one who joins (ευδοκία). Nevertheless he also says ενωσι *unio**. This union takes place in a special prosopon which he calls *prosopon of union* (προσώπου τή ἑνώσεω) [5] which is neither the prosopon of the pre-existing Word nor that of the man, but of them both together. This prosopon is not therefore a physical prosopon, but a moral or juridical *personality,* that is, in reality, a simple and even accidental property.

4. It is true that Nestorius admitted in addition, at least in the *Book of Heraclides,* the expression of physical prosopon, but in this case he distinguishes the physical prosopon of the human nature from the physical prosopon of the divine nature[6].* Doubtlessly, they lend themselves mutually to one and the other [7], but personal unity is constituted by this "hold" on one or other of the physical prosopons by the prosopon of union, and this union is purely moral. The same is to be said, even should the physical prosopon primarily signify the ensemble of the properties of the nature of the person[8], and only in an indirect way the person itself, which was but little stressed among the Antiochians.—Thus

‘ Κατ' ουσίαν; καθ' ὑπόστασιν.

a On this comparison, see p. 36.

3 See Loors, *op. cit.,* p. 24S-249.

4 *Ibid.,* p. 242.

5 *Ibid.,* p. 193-194. See chiefly the Book of Heraclides, pp. 127, 128, 132, 146, 2S2.

6 *Book ofHereu.,* pp. 50, 194, 212, 213, etc.

? " It is because Jesus Christ, the Man-God, is one Person by means of the *prosopon* of union, that in Him the "*prosopon* of the human nature is used by the divine nature, and that of the divine nature by the human nature that is to say that Jesus Christ God (but still man) acts as man, and that Jesus Christ man {but still God) acts as God". J. 'Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*. in, p. 29, Cf. *ibid.,* p. 29-32.

8 Thus in Nestorius' vocabulary *prosopon* seems usually to have had the somewhat vague meaning of personality in the wide sense, not only in the expression *prosopon of union* but even in that of physical prosopon. Hence the prosopon is distinguished from φυσι and ὑπόστασι which both mean *natine,* in the full sense of a *complete* and individual *nature* which is perfected by the prosopon.

the substantial unity of Christ was compromised, Saint Cyril's fears justified and the condemnation at Ephesus made legitimate.

5. This conclusion is rendered even stronger if we admit, with Father Jugie, that for Nestorius φὺσ and ὑπόστασι directly designate not only the nature but also the person ; for in that case the physical prosopon is not in reality distinct from them, since all the three expressions, οὐσι , υπόστασή , προσωπον *(physical)* would all mean person *, as at Alexandria, whilst on the contrary the *prosopon of union* would signify a simple moral and accidental union. Submitted to such energetic treatment 23 Nestorius' system becomes even more obviously different from Saint Cyril's. The difference between them no longer appears to consist in mere divergencies of viewpoint and terminology. It appears in its true light as a radical opposition of two doctrines : hypostatic dualism (of persons) on the one hand, unity of hypostasis or person on the other 3.

CHAPTER II.

Saint Cyril of Alexandria.

Special Bibliography :

Editions : *P. G.,* 68-77 (Aubert's edition, 1638, with Mai's supplements.) Partial edition (important), Pusey, Oxford, 7 vols. 1868-1877.

Studies: Tillemont, *Mémoires,* t. xiv (1709), p. 267-676, 747-795. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* t. ii, p. 219-422. Fessler-JUNGMANN, *Institutiones,* II, p. 13-87. J. Mahe, *Cyrille (VAlexandrie* (saint), in *Diet, thiol.,* 2476-2527 ; *Les anathématisnics,* in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1906 (t. vin), p. 505-542 ; *DEucharistie d'après S. Cyrille, ibid.,* 1907 (t. Vili), p. 677-696; *La sanctification d'après S. Cyr., ibid.,* 1909 (t. X), p. 30-40, 469-492. A. Largent, ó·. *Cyrille et le concile d'Ephèse,* in *Rev. Quest. Hist.,* 1872 (t. xii), p. 5-70 (See *Et. d'Hist. Eccl.,* 1892). P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie,* p. 454-480. M. Jugie, *Nestorius...,* p. 174-190 especially. F. Nau, 5. *Cyrille et Nestorius,* in *Rev. Orient, chrét.,* 1900 (t. XV), p. 365-391 ; 1911 (t. XVI), 1-54.

1 See M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 96.

a Founded on this principle, current at Antioch and hardly opposed at Alexandria : " Every complete nature is a person ", See M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 4, 91, 290.

3 See this aspect of the Nestorian system in M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* Ch. in, p· 94-135-

I. LIFE AND WORKS.

A) The Man. His Character.

Saint Cyril was the great Doctor sent by Providence to defend the traditional doctrine of the personal unity of Christ, just as Athanasius had been destined to formulate the dogma of His Divinity. After Origen, he was the most powerful theologian of the Greek Church. He is the *Doctor of tiie Incarnation.* Our principal aim, therefore, will be to explain his teaching. For this purpose a study will first be made of the man himself, his life, his writings, with the exception of those on the Christological question, in order to arrive at a better understanding of his doctrinal influence in the great struggle in which he engaged with Nestorius after the year 430.

Saint Cyril was the *nephew of Theophilus l,* patriarch of Alexandria, who has achieved a doubtful fame on account of his hostility to Saint John Chrysostom, whom he had deposed at the Synod of the Oak (403). Cyril himself was present at this ¡jetty Council. Nothing is known of his age at that time nor of his functions. He had been carefully brought up either by his parents, who resided in Alexandria, or by his uncle. It is supposed that he was a monk and disciple of Isidore of Pelusium; in no other way can the latter's familiarity in sending him four unusually frank letters be explained.

Theophilus having died in 412, Cyril was called upon to take his place in spite of opposition from those who, mindful of his uncle's violent proceedings, regarded him with suspicion. He possessed a self-willed, enterprising, pugnacious character, somewhat imperious and even hard. He seems to have inherited the latter trait, but it was probably developed through long intercourse with his uncle. Undisputed head of all the Egyptian Churches[2], he was not the kind of man to surrender easily his rights, nor one who would hesitate to attack any who offended his convictions. But age, experience and above all grace, brought with them a restraining influence on his character, and at a later date,

[*] See Vol. 1, p. 496.

[3] The title ot Pharaoh, if it were somewhat more respectful, would exactly describe both the power and the dominating character of the great patriarch.

when the faith was no longer threatened, this impetuous Alexandrian was destined to throw his weight on the side of the representatives of a rival school, in spite of the protests of his best friends who accused him of weakness and treason.

The salient feature of Saint Cyril's character was, therefore, his energy. He showed it right from the beginning of his episcopate in the rigour he used towards the *Jews* and the *Novations.* Socrates, who had strong sympathies with the latter, avenged them by portraying him as a man of impulsive and violent temperament. He referred in particular to the conflict with Orestes, even insinuating that Cyril had a hand in the murder of Hypatia, the famous Neo-Platonist philosopher, a friend of Orestes. These stories of Socrates represent an enemy's witness and are no more than rumours then current in Constantinople, a town naturally hostile to the Alexandrians. It is said that about the year 417 Saint Cyril retracted his past error and made peace with those who retained a pious remembrance of Saint John Chrysostom, whose name he restored to the Alexandrian diptychs; but this is conjecture rather than a well-grounded historical conclusion.

A better insight into Cyril's character may be gained from his literary work. This work is one of the most considerable in Oriental Patristic literature, itself so fertile in men of genius; which goes to show that this worthy successor of Saint Athanasius was not onlv a man of action but also a fertile writer and a first-class thinker. Controversy occupied a large place in his life, and in this field he was a master, as witness his vigorous, precise and incisive style, though in other works he has been reproached with writing in a lagging, diffuse and almost colourless manner. Another feature which must be pointed out in this work, even as regards the part written previously to the Nestorian controversy, is the place given to *Christ.* It is easily perceptible that the Man-God was the focus of all Cyril's thought, and that he was well equipped to defend this mystery of the traditional faith. It was not in the controversies that he learnt of Christ; rather was it his deep knowledge of the Saviour that drew him into these doctrinal struggles in which the very reality of the Incarnation was at stake.

B) His literary work.

The apologetical and controversial writings, which are essentially dogmatic, will here be classed apart from the others which chiefly concern Holy Scripture.

i. **Controversial and dogmatic literature.** This is the most varied, the best known and perhaps the most volum-inous of Cyril's literary bequest to posterity. His chief opponents, together with the Jews and the Novatians who have already received mention, are *a)* the Pagans; *b)* the Arians; *c)* the Apollinarists; and ¿Z) especially the Nestorians.

a) The Contra Julianum Imperatorem was a monumental refutation in thirty books of Julian the Apostate's three books " Against the Gospels and against the Christians " *. This work, which appeared after 433, dedicated to the Emperor Theodosius II, is extant only in part ; only the first ten books remain2. The author shows the superiority of the Bible story over Greek legends, and at the same time proves that Christianity is not degenerate Judaism, as some averred, but the true inheritance promised to Abraham.

b} Against the Arians under the common title of *De sancta et consubstantiali Trinitate,* Saint Cyril left two important works, anterior to the Christological controversies : a *Thesaurus* and a *Dialogue.*

1. The *Thesaurus*3*is a collection of 35 theses or dissertations (λο'γοι), which explain in an orderly and precise way the traditional teaching on the Trinity. The author obviously drew on the Cappadocians, Saint Epiphanius and especially Saint Athanasius.

2. The *Dialogue* gives in a less rigorous form—in seven conversations between the author and Hermias—the same teaching on the divinity and the consubstantiality of the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father ‹.

c) The Apollinarists had their turn in the *Liber contra synousiastas* (of which only fragments remain5). As for the Anthropomorphites, it is not known to what extent Cyril composed the treatise 6 against them, at least in its present state.

rZ) But it was especially Nestorianism, after 429, which drew Saint Cyril's attention and produced the most treatises from his pen; thirteen of these are extant. They will be studied below in connection whith the Christological controversy and his doctrine. We give here the complete list, classed under three heads7.

The first controversial treatises: 1. *Scholia de Incarnatione Unigeniti;* 2. *De rectafide ad Theodosium Imp.;* 3. *De rectafide ad Princi-*

1 See P. Allard, *Julien ΓApostat,* in, 107-123. This lost work of Julian's has been partly reconstituted from St. Cyril's quotations.
2 *P. G.,* 76, 503-1064. — 3 *p. G.,* 75, 9-656. – ‹ *P. G.,* 75, 657-1124.
5 Edited by Mai. See *P. G.,* 76, 1427-1428 (in Latin).
6 *P. G.,* 76, 1065-1x32.
7 All these writings are in *P. G.t* 75 77. See below for further details.

pissas {ad Reginas, liber I) ; 4. *De recta fide ad Augustas {ad Reginas,* liber II); 5. *Actversus Nestorii blasphemias.*

Treatises written on the occasion of the Councils of Alexandria and Ephesus: 1. the *Anathematisms;* 2. *Apologéticas contra Orientales;* 3. *Apologéticas contra Theodoretum;* 4. *Explicatio duodecim capitum;* 5. *Apologéticas ad Theodosium.*

Later writings : i. *Quod unus sit Christus* (dialogue); 2. *Quod R. Maria sit Deipara* (Θεοτόκο) ; 3. *Contra Theodoretum et Diodorum* (fragments) *.

Saint Cyril's correspondence[1] also deals in great measure with the Nestorian controversy. It numbers 88 letters, but the last (letter from Hypatia to Cyril, which is forged), the eightieth (from St. Basil) and 17 from the Bishop's correspondents must be subtracted from this number. The remaining 69 are Saint Cyril's[3][4] They are important from a historical and doctrinal viewpoint, especially as regards Christology. The following deserve special mention : letter I *(to the monks* on Christ the Man-God and the Virgin, Θεοτόκο); IV *(2nd to Nestorius,* a commentary of the Nicene Creed; approved at Ephesus); XVII *(3rd to Nestotius,* a synodal letter, containing the anathematisms); XXXIX [4] *(to John of Antioch ;* it contains the formula of union of the year 433); *(to Aeacius of Melitene;* it tells of the union and explains the δύο (θύσει and the μία ούσ'. τού Θεού Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη); XLV and XLVI *(to Succensus* on the same expressions); *LN (In sanctum Symbolum;* comments the Nicene Creed against the Arians, the Apollinarists and the Nestorians).

20 Non-controversial writings.—The majority concern the Holy Scriptures and are written in the form of <i) treatises; *b}* commentaries; c) homilies.

rz) The exegetical treatises are the *De adoratione in spiritu et veritate;* and the *Glaphyra in Pentateuchum.*

i. In the De Adoratione [5] Saint Cyril shows that the "law and the prophets are not abolished but perfected, since the rites practised

1 Several other dogmatic writings have been wrongly attributed to Cyril. In Migne : *De Sancta Trinitate* (Theodoret's), *G.,* 75, 1147-1190; *De sacrosancta Trinitate (St.* John Damascene), *P. G.,* 77, 1119-1174: *De Incarnatione Domini* (Theodorei), *P. G.,* 75, 1419-1478 ; Zλ' *Incarnatione Terbi Dei, P. G.,* 75, I4I3'I42°, and *Dialogus cu/n Nestorio, P. G., 76,* 247-256 (later compilations). — 3 *P. G.,* 77, 9'39°·

3 They are not classed in chronological order and it is not easy to determine the date of their composition.

4 Letters 4, 17, 39 have been edited apart under the title *Epistola tres acumeniece,* Pusey, in 1872.

5 *P. G.,* 68, 133- 1126. The treatise comprises 17 books.

in a material way by the Jews find their continuation in the spiritual adoration that the Christians pay to God ; the Jewish observances were the figure and the shadow of the new worship"[1]. Taking as a starting point the prescriptions of the Old Law, he teaches Christians the doctrine of the Church on the avoidance of sin (bk. i), justification through Christ (2-3), and its moral consequences (4-5), the love of God and one's neighbour (6-8), the Church and the priesthood (9-13), the spiritual worship due to God (14-16) ; the last book (17) shows that the solemn feasts are a foretaste of heaven.

2. The purpose of the Glaphyra[2] was to determine all the figures of Christ contained in the books of Moses. Hence the author studied only those passages of the Pentateuch which he thought contained one of these mysterious types of Christ. Such were, in *Genesis:* Adam, Abel, Noe, Abraham, Melchisedech, Isaac, Jacob, and his sons; in *Exodus:* the burning bush, the paschal lamb, the manna, etc.; in *Leviticus:* the prescriptions which signify the Passion and the sanctification *of* men; in *Numbers,* the spies sent into Canaan, the red cow, the brazen serpent; lastly in *Deuteronomy,* the sacrificial heifer (ch. 21), the captive woman *(ibidi),* the stone covered with lime (ch. 27), the election of Josué (ch. 31). I

b) Saint Cyril's Scriptural commentaries, in the true meaning of the word, in addition to fairly numerous *fragments*^, preserved in the Chains, on various books of the Old Testament (Kings, Psalms, Proverbs, Canticle of Canticles, Jeremías, Baruch, Ezechiel, Daniel), or of the New (St. Matthew, St. Luke, perhaps St. Mark, Ep. to the Romans, Corinthians, Hebrews...), consist of studies on Isaías[3] on minor prophets[4], and on St. John[5]. Although the exegete here follows the text more closely than in the foregoing writings he still endeavours to show that the Old Law is but the figure and the preparation of the New.

The fine commentary on the Gospel of Saint John is among those which have contributed in the greatest measure to establish his doctrinal authority. It was written before the Nestorian controversy[7] and reveals how much Cyril was drawn to a study of the Trinity, that most profound of mysteries. He was primarily preoccupied with refuting the Arians, who denied the doctrine, but neither did he neglect the pastor's duty of showing how his principles should be applied in the whole of Christian

1 J. Make, *op. cit.,* col. 2484.

2 *G.,* 69, 13-67S. The word γλαφυρό , of which the original signification is polished, sculptured or elegant, here takes the meaning of *beautiful passage, a chosen passage of the Pentateuch.*

3 *P. G.,* 69, 679-1294; 70, 1451-1462; 74, 7571023. — 4 *P. G.,* 70, 9-1450.

5 *P. G.,* 71, 9-1062; 72, 9, 364.

6 *P. G.,* 73, and 74, 9-756. The treatise comprises to books, but onlv fragments of books vu and vm are now extant, and even Aubert's careful edition, as found in Migne, is not altogether trustworthy.

7 See J. Mahé, in *Pull. lift, ecd.,* 1907, p. 41-45.

life*. In book I, dealing with the Prologue of Saint John, he shows the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, and in book II, His perfect equality with Him, while frequently in other books (in, ix, X, xn) he comes back to this subject. Book XI demonstrates in particular the divinity of the Holy Ghost. The splendid excursions on the Eucharist in book iv, and on the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the soul in book V, should also be noted. The author of such a work, which is worthy of comparison with Saint Augustine's commentary on the same Gospel, was well equipped to defend the personal unity of the Man-God, accustomed as he was to envisage the divine aspect of the Incarnation and to throw into relief the Person of the Incarnate Son of God.

ή Saint Cyril's homilies, which must have been very numerous[1], are for the most part no longer extant. Only some two series remain, together with various fragments [3]*

1. The homilies on Saint Luke, numbering 156, are preserved in a fairly trustworthy Syriac translation [4]. These sermons are pastoral and practical in nature rather than purely theological. This work was composed after 429.

2. The paschal homilies [5], 29 in number [6], consist of pastoral letters from Saint Cyril to his people during Lent and at Eastertime. Before fixing the date of the latter, the Bishop exhorts the Christians to do penance, to cleanse themselves of their sins and to practise virtue that they may share in a greater measure in the fruits of the Redemption. He reminds them of the Church's teaching on this great mystery, and on occasion warns them against certain errors. Thus in 420 he protested against "those who divide Christ in two and would make of Him a man united to the Word by a simple moral union"[7], an evident allusion to Antiochian tendencies. In 429 the doctrine is even more precise and Cyril affirms in so many words that Mary is "the mother of the Lord and the mother of God" [8]. The Nestorian controversy had begun, although Nestorius was not yet named.

1 This aspect is still more noticeable in the *Thesaurus*.

3 See Gennadius, *De viris ill.*, 57. — 3p, *G.*, ηη, 981-1116.

4 Syriac edition by R. Payne Smith, Oxford, 1858; Eng. trans, by the same in 1859. Re-edited in *Corp. Or.*, sect, iv, t. I, 1912; the remainder is in course of preparation. Greek extant fragments in *P. G.*, 72, 475-950.

5 *P. G., T],* 401-982.

6 The collection numbers 30, but the 3rd is missing, as if it were lost. In reality Saint Cyril wrote no letter in 413; the 1st is that of 414, the 2nd of 415, and the 3rd (416) is numbered 4th in the collection. The others follow regularly until 442. Those of 443 and 444 are not extant.

7 *Hom. pase.*, 8.

3 Μήτηρ Κυρίου και θεού. *Horn. pase.* 17. This expression is equivalent to Θεοτόκο .

3. The so-called homilies of Ephesus r, which were preached during the Council, are famous among the writings of the early Church, especially the 4th (in the present series), preached between June 23rd and 27th, which showers the most eulogistic titles on Mary. To this series must be added seven or eight sermons on various subjects and fragments of other discourses 2

IL SAINT CYRIL AND THE NESTORIAN CONTROVERSY,

A) Before the Council.

Nestorius took up his stand against the Θεοτόκο 3 at the end of 429. Already, as we have said, at the beginning of 429 Saint Cyril had warned his flock against the new error. A letter which he wrote shortly afterwards *to the monks* is still more definite4, so much so in fact that although Nestorius was not named, he clearly perceived that he was the person aimed at and showed signs of anger. Cyril wrote to him on two occasions in an endeavour to lead him back to orthodoxy. He received but sourish replies. It should be remembered that at this time a most unfortunate state of tension existed between Alexandria and Constantinople, for each town held against the other " humiliations and insults to be avenged, and this circumstance," says Tixeront5, "contributed in great measure to render impossible, right from the outset, a calm and friendly discussion of the question in dispute ", There are not sufficient grounds to affirm, however, as do certain historians, that Saint Cyril's conduct in the affair is to be explained by such motives. He was too great a theologian not to perceive at first glance the importance of the question, on which depended the whole of the Christian religion. His zeal for orthodoxy led him to be rigorous when he despaired of succeeding in any other way.

He first endeavoured to prevent all disaffection among his flock (429) by a simple explanation of the traditional doctrine of the Incarnation in the *Scholia de Incarnatione Unigeniti**. At the same lime, with his characteristic resolution, he warned the Court against the reformer by three writings *De recta fide*l, addressed respectively (430) to the Emperor Theodosius II (408-450), to the young princesses, Arcadia and Marina, and the third to the Empresses Pulcheria (Theodosius' eldest sister) and Eudocia (his wife). In this same year he also answered a collection of sermons published by the heresiarch, in his five books *Against the blasphemies of Nestorius*8.

' Among the *22 homilía diversa (P. G., 77,* 981-1116), that is, homilies I, 2, 4· 5» 6, 7, 8. The nth *(Encomium in sanctam Mariani Deiparam)* is a work of the vn-ixth century, imitated from the 4th homily.

2 The whole is to be found in *P. G., 77,* 981-1'116, under the title *Homilía diversa* 22. — 3 See the preceding Chapter.

4 *Epist. I.* See J. Mahé, *op. cit.,* col. 12478. — 5 *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 37.

! »· 7ê' —*TP. G.*. 76, 1132-1200; 1201-1336; 1336-1412. '

8 *P. G.,* 76, 9-24S.

Meanwhile Nestorius did not remain inactive. In an endeavour to find himself a powerful protector he turned in the year 429 to the Pope, Saint Celestine I (422-432) and in one of his letters asked that a Council should be convoked to justify him. The Pope, however, was not content to rely on information received from Constantinople; he asked for more, towards the middle of the same year at Alexandria. Saint Cyril put off his answer for more than a year L Finally, he realised it was time for him to communicate "to the Holy Father" (Θεοφιλεστάτω πατρί) "whom the ancient custom of the Churches ordains us to warn when the faith is in danger" 2. He joined to his letter a memorandum explaining the controversy and the text of all the writings he had composed with reference to it. In August 430, in a Roman Synod of Western Bishops the Pope condemned Nestorius' teaching and signed four letters for the East on the nth August. One of these was addressed to Nestorius (summoned to retract within ten days), a second to the Church of Constantinople, a third to John of Antioch, and, lastly, a fourth to Saint Cyril, who was charged with executing the Roman sentence as representative of the Pope 3.

On the receipt of this letter, Saint Cyril convoked in Alexandria a Synod of Egyptian Bishops. After the Council a synodal 4 letter was drawn up, aimed at Nestorius, which terminated with the famous *Twelve propositions he must anathematise,* which were considered to leave him no loophole. Unfortunately these formulas, although bearing witness to their author's perspicacity, possessed many drawbacks. Not only did they set forth a series of precisions and details that had not been demanded by the Pope, but they explained the dogma in terms which were bound to offend educated Antiochians : thus, more often than not, the word ὑπόστασι was taken in the meaning of person, whilst at Antioch it was considered, in Christology, as synonymous

' "Probably through desire to avoid giving too great prominence to the affair", says J. Mahe, *op. eit.,* col. 2479.

3 *Epist.* π. See Mansi, *Coneil.,* t. iv, col. ion.

3 Pope Celestine wrote thus to Saint Cyril : "The authority of our See is communicated to you, and you will use it our place to execute rigorously our decree". *Ibid.,* 1019. All the documents on the Council of Ephesus and its preliminaries are in Mansi, *Cone.,* t. iv, col. 567 sq. and t. v. See M. Jugie, *Ephèse (condied')* in *Diet. théol.,* col. 137-163.

4 *Epist.* 17. A text of the anathematisms will be found in Denzinger-Bann., *Enchiridion,* n. 113-124. See also J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Do°m.,* in, 41-42.

with nature; similarly, the expression ἑνωσι φυσικὴ was necessarily understood by those theologians who were used to combating Apollinarists, in the sense of a fusion of natures, and not as a *real, veritable and substantial union* [1] in the meaning given to it by Saint Cyril, as opposed to a simple moral union.

Nestorius, advised by John of Antioch and Theodoret, had already made a conciliatory answer to the Pope, but had not given way as regards his request for a Council. On receiving the Alexandrian documents he thought he obtained proof that Cyril was an Apollinarist and answered with 12 *contra-anathematisms.* The Orientals (John of Antioch, Theodoret, Andrew of Samosata) also turned violently on the Bishop of Alexandria. Although Saint Cyril went to great lengths in explaining, and clearly rejected Apollinarianism in a double apology *{Ap. against the Orientals]·* and *Ap. against Theodoret 3)* he was unable to clear up the misunderstanding.

B) The Council of Ephesus (431).

On every side there was the desire for a General Council. In November 430 the Emperor Theodosius II took the step of convoking it at Ephesus for Whit Sunday (7th June) 431 [4]. A number of threats were contained in the letter sent to Saint Cyril [5]. He asked advice of the Pope, who persuaded him to accept the Council in order that Nestorius' retractation might be obtained there; any condemnations were to be suspended and come into effect only in the event of Nestorius refusing to retract. Further, the Pope sent three special legates to the Council[6], with instructions to support Cyril and not to act as controversialists but as judges. Celestine's letter to the Council clearly affirmed the Roman primacy and

1 The *person,* in the unity of which tlie union is made, being a complete *substance,* a complete and autonomus *nature,* the union could be called physical. See above, *Introduction,* p. 13. But the danger of this expression is obvious.

3 Apologeticus liber pro 12 capitulis contra 0> tentales : P. G., 76, 315-386.

3 Apologeticus contra Theodoretuni : P. G., 76, 385-452.

4 Here, as in the other Councils which in practice were called by the Emperors, it was the Pope's participation or approval which conferred their authority on the Fathers and constituted the real and formal convocation of the Council.

5 Saint Augustine, the news oí whose death on the 28th August of the same year had not yet reached Constantinople, was sent a special invitation. Mansi, iv, 1208.

6 The Roman Council was represented by two bishops, Arcadius and Projectus, while the Pope was represented personally by the priest Philip, who spoke in his name.

the need of submission to the Pontifical decision against Nestorius.

The Council was to have assembled on the /th June, 431. But when this day came, neither John of Antioch nor the Pope's legates had arrived. Tired of waiting, Saint Cyril opened the assembly on June 22nd in the presence of 159 bishops and a representative of the Bishop of Carthage. In spite of the contrary opinion expressed by 68 bishops on the previous day, the fact of his having received the Roman delegation in the previous year against Nestorius x, together with John of Antioch's declaration made some days before, led him to think that he was justified in beginning without more ado1. In the 1st session (22nd June), which was held in spite of protests from the Imperial Commissioner and Nestorius' refusal to appear, the assembly, after the reading of the *Nicene Creed,* took note of the first documents in the controversy (letters from Cyril 3,4 Nestorius and the Pope), listened to several passages from the Fathers contrary to Nestorius' teaching, and finally, having in vain endeavoured to obtain a retractation from the heretic, pronounced sentence of excommunication and deposition, which was signed by 198 Fathers (38 bishops joined themselves to the original 160 in approving their decision). The sentence began with these words : " Urged by the canons and the letters of our Very Holy Father and colleague, Celestine, Bishop of Rome... 4". The news was enthusiastically received in the town of Ephesus, where there was a great devotion to the doctrine of Mary Θεοτόκο , which moreover was ardently defended by the bishop, Memnon, one of Saint Cyril's most faithful counsellors.

Nestorius protested against this condemnation in a letter, signed by ten bishops, which he sent to the Court. On the 26th June, John of Antioch and his suffragans arrived. He associated himself with

1 In spile of the sending of the legates, Cyril could still consider himself as the Pope's legate. At the Council he did indeed act as such, and the legates who had come from Rome had orders not to disassociate themselves from him.

2 According to the Acts of the Council (Mansi, iv, 1342), this opinion was brought from John by two bishops. It is true that elsewhere *{Ibid.,* iv, 1232, 1236) these same bishops are mentioned as being opposed to the opening of the Council. But from this ambiguous attitude we cannot conclude to the nullity of their first declaration.

3 Letter 17 (the 3rd to Nestorius) containing the anathematisms, was read, but we do not read that it was specially approved, though letter 4 (the 2nd to Nestorius) was declared to conform to the faith.

4 Mansi, *Conctl.,* iv, 1211.

the protesting bishops and called a meeting of 43 bishops — which a certain critic graced with the name of *true Council* of Ephesus ! — and condemned Cyril and all the members of the Council as Apollinarists. He then sent in a report to the Emperor, who, warned by his agents, seemed to favour the opposers.

When the Pope's legates arrived, Saint Cyril, in spite of the Emperor's opposition, called for a second general session of the Council, on July loth. The Pope's resolute letter, in which he requested that the Council should do no more than promulgate the Romain sentence against Nestorius, was read to the assembly. The Fathers welcomed it in these words: " Here is the true judgment; let us give thanks to the new Paul, Celestine; to the new Paul, Cyril; to Celestine, the guardian of the faith " [1]. The legates asked to see the Acts of the first session in order to confirm them (ινα βεβαιώσω γεν) [2]. This was done, and in the third session they approved them. In this same session the legate, Philip, spoke in well chosen terms of the Roman primacy, founded on Peter, " who lives and judges in his successors " [3], a solemn declaration that raised no opposition in the assembly. The whole conduct of the Fathers proves that it was adopted by the Council [4], as is also seen in the Acts. Nestorius himself approved this teaching, although he refused to submit to it [5].

During the latter part of July the Council held four other sessions, IV-VII, during which vain attempts were made to secure the adhesion of John of Antioch and the Orientals, who were even excommunicated at the Vllth and last session. In addition, the latter promulgated six canons, of which two are especially important: I. against the Pelagians; 2. against the Nestorians and Pelagians [6]. A decree of the Vlth session, forbidding the composition and spreading of formularies of faith different from that of Nicaea [7] was evidently aimed only at private individuals, including perhaps

1 *Ibid.,* IV, 1287. — 2 *Ibid.,* IV, 12S9.

• " There is no one who doubts, or rather it has been a known fact for centuries, that the holy and blessed Peter, the prince and head of the Apostles, the column of faith, the foundation of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the kingdom, and that to Him has been given the power to forgive and to retain sins; it is He who until now. and for ever, lives and judges in His successors ". Mansi, *Cone.,* IV, 1296. Denzinger-B., 112. See M. Jugie, *of>. cil.,* 155-158.

4 These words, however, cannot be regarded as a decision of the Council.

5 M. Jugie, *Nestorius,* p. 294-303.

6 See Denzinger-B., *Ench.,* 126, 127 (can. 1, 4).

l Ibid., n. 125. See M. Jugie, *Ephèse,* col. 148-152.

the bishops, but was not calculated to fetter the supreme authority of the Church or of an Oecumenical Council. Indeed, but twenty years later a new formulary was presented at the Council of Chalcedon r. Saint Cyril had been the soul of all these assemblies. At the same time he wielded a determining influence outside the Council by means of his brilliant sermons, which are still extant 1*

Nevertheless the Nestorian party won favour at Court. Saint Cyril, together with Memnon, his most ardent defender, was imprisoned by an Imperial order in August 431. His imprisonment lasted for three months, during which time he wrote a new explanation of his anathematisms *(Explicatio 12 capitum)* '. Finally his friends were able to convince the Emperor of the true state of affairs, so that Theodosius freed Cyril in October, approved the condemnation of Nestorius, whose See was given to another and whose writings were severely prohibited, and, lastly, definitely dismissed the Council. Saint Cyril returned to Alexandria at the end of October and from the moment of his arrival set himself out to clear himself of all the accusations which had been made against him, in his *Apology to Theodosius*45

C) After the Council.

Even after the Council the Orientals still refused to recognise the condemnation of Nestorius and, in particular, to approve the anathematisms. They persisted in this attitude for three years. Finally, in 433, thanks to the initiative of the Pope and the Emperor, an expression was found which reconciled at least John of Antioch and a large group of Orientals with Saint Cyril and the Egyptians. In this formula of unions, sometimes called the "Creed of Ephesus", it was Cyril who, in an attempt to avoid an imminent schism, made the most concessions. These, however, were purely formal in nature: he renounced the expressions μία οὐσι , ἑνωσι φυσική. Θεοτόκο was admitted only subject to explanations. But he was compensated not only by the fact of Nestorius' condemnation, but also in the doctrinal sphere by

l That alone condemns those who at a later date would have rejected, in the name of the Council of Ephesus, the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed. The heretics abused this canon of Ephesus in order to reject the new formulas which expressly condemned their own reforms, but it was declared at Chalcedon that "the law forbids the wicked to sin without depriving the judges of their authority". Mansi, vii, 464. Cf. *ibid.*, 456-457.

l See above, p. 26.

* *P. G.*, 76, 295-312.

**P. G., 76,* 455-488.

5 To be found in the letter from of Antioch to Cyril *(Epist. Cyr.,* 38) and in the latter's answer *(Epist.* 39: *Latentur cali).* See J. Mahe, *op. cit.,* 24S1-2483 and 2511-2515.

the giving up of the word συνάφεια (chiefly a moral union) which was replaced by ενωσι , and the recognition of the communication of idioms.

Cyril's difficulties, however, were not at an end with his reconciliation with John of Antioch. In the East, or more precisely in Syria, several bishops continued to regard him as an Apollinarist. Others, more moderate, such as Theodoret, recognised his orthodoxy, but still refused to condemn Nestorius. Even in Egypt Cyril met with resistance, but in a contrary sense. He was reproached with weakness. He was accused of betraying the faith as defined at Ephesus by his too great concessions. He was obliged to justify himself even to his friends, such as Isidore of Pelusium L It should be noted, however, that some of these friends were already convinced Monophysites. All Saint Cyril's correspondence at this time has but one purpose: to show that he had sacrificed none of the teaching of the anathematisms. In order to prove his faith he employed at this period a forceful expression, with which he has often been reproached 2.

Untiring in his zeal for the triumph of orthodoxy, Saint Cyril did not content himself merely with letters, even after 433. He composed several new treatises :

I. *Quod units esi Christus*,* a theological dialogue, which explains the twofold generation, both divine and human, of Christ, and shows that in Him the two natures are indissolubly united, as the body and soul unite to form a man.

2. *Adversus nolentes confiteri sanctam Virginem esse Deiparam* 4, which is a little work gathering together all the Scriptural authority justifying our Lady's title of Mother *of* God.

3. *Contra Theodorum et Diodorums.* This writing dates from the time when Nestorius' followers in Syria, unable to propagate his writings, began to spread those of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, which were more harmful even than those of Nestorius. Saint Cyril, encouraged thereto by Rabulas, Bishop of Edessa, boldly denounced the Christological errors of these two authors;6 but against his friends' advice refused to condemn them.

---

1 See letters, 40, 43-46, 48-5°, 54» 57, 58. Cf. Isid., *Epist.* 1, 324.

' For the meaning of this formula Μα φόσι τού θεού Λογου σεσαοκωμένη, see below, p. 35·

• *P- G.,* 75, 1253-1362.

4 *P.* σ., 76, 255 292. A little dialogue on the same subject also deserves mention *(Dialogus cum Neslorio, P. G.,* 76, 247-256).

s *P. G..* 76, 1437-1452 (mere fragments in Latin"; the remainder is lost)

6 On these discussions ... Saining Theodore, see *Epbt.* 55, 63, 64. 65,' 67-74 (73, from Rabulas).

Saint Cyril always remained the watchful guardian of the orthodox faith. Even after he was reconciled with John of Antioch he did not hesitate to condemn the latter's vacillation in dealing with the followers of Nestorius. John contented himself with very imprecise professions of faith and vague promises which encouraged purely outward submissions. Cyril wrote to him to remind him that "although peace is desirable, it should not be obtained at the price of orthodoxy ; everyone must condemn Nestorius and his impieties". John died in 441, followed soon after by Cyril (444), who no doubt never foresaw the strange perversion which the Monophysites were soon to make of the formula which he had employed in defence of the true faith.

III. SAINT CYRIL'S DOCTRINE.

A) The Doctor.

Among the Greek Fathers, Saint Cyril's authority has been the most decisive with regard to definitions of Christian teaching. Just as Saint Athanasius, in the previous century, had brought about the triumph of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ and His substantial equality with the Father, so Saint Cyril was destined to refute with success the error of those who divided Christ, and who ruined the doctrine of the Incarnation. He trusted especially to the Scriptures and Tradition for the establishment of this doctrine, and it is this that makes him a true *Doctor* of astonishing power.

He was also a born theologian, indulging in deep meditation on revealed truths and studying the mysteries with the help of reason. It is possible that he surpasses all the other Oriental Fathers by his perspicacity; while in the West only Augustine perhaps is greater. Nevertheless the imperfection of his theological terminology must be recognised; and the very fact of this imprecision betrays a defect in his philosophy k It should be remembered, however, that for him, the latter took second place, since he went for his teaching to tradition rather then to reason. It may even be said that these defects had compensating advantages : they led Cyril to use so concrete a style that they left no opening to Nestorian casuistry.

* Sec above, p. 13.

It was given to the Bishop of Alexandria to put an end to the Trinitarian controversies and to seal in some wise orthodox teaching in the East, much as did Saint Augustine in the West with his immortal *De Trinitate.* We will not, however, labour this point. Of greater interest here is his teaching not only on the *Christologicat question,* but also on *sanctifying grace,* of which he is pre-eminently the Doctor.

B) His Christological Teaching'

As we have said above[2], Saint Cyril had a tendency to compare and even to identify completely φύσι , ὑπόστασι , πρόσωπον : in Christology all these terms have usually the same meaning for Cyril; [3] they refer to one and the same reality, the *person.* The explanation of his use of these expressions and the special meaning he gives to them is to be found in his attitude regarding the study of the Incarnation.

Like the true Alexandrian that he was [4], he was primarily attracted to the divine aspect of Christ; the *Word* is the centre of all this theology of the Incarnation. Cyril calls the Word *prosopon,* and more often *hypostasis,* and this term, by which, since the end of the fourth century, the Divine Persons were signified, shows the close connection which, to his mind, united the mystery of the Trinity to the mystery of the Incarnation. Pie also calls the Word φύσι , because of the *divine nature* which He possesses equally with the Father and the Iloly Ghost. Such nobility of thought animates the whole work of the patriarch of Alexandria with powerful supernatural inspiration.

Saint Cyril energetically stresses the radical unity (ενοτη) of the Incarnate Words. The only-begotten Son of God, the Word, was perfect before the Incarnation. He wished to take to Himself a human nature, which, however, added nothing to Him and in no way changed Him in Himself. He Who was previously ἀσαρκο , is become " flesh " *{caro* σἀρξ), that is to say man;[0] He is "born" a man, but no new person is produced by the Incarnation; the Word is " born"

1 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*. in, p. 60-79. M· Jugie, *Nestorius,* p. 156-190.
3 See the *Introduction* to Book HI, p. 13·
' Exceptionally the word ^ὐσι is employed ; for instance in the strict sense of nature; it is thus that in the act of union he speaks of two natures, by pure condescendance. .1
4 See the characteristics of the Alexandrian School, λΓο1. I, p. 297, sq.
5 See chiefly the treatise, *Quod unus sit Christus.*
6 He explains in his letter 46, 1, that the word "flesh", used as in Saint John, docs not exclude the intelligent soul, as the Apollinarists supposed.

by uniting with a human nature, without losing anything of His unity.

In order that the personal *unity* of Christ should not suffer from this union, it is not enough merely to affirm it; the explanation of this union must not destroy the personal unity. Such was the Nestorian error. By making too great a distinction between the man and God, by admitting only a moral relative union, they divided Christ. For them, since the human nature was joined to the Word by only a frail link it took on an independence which raised it to the dignity of a person. It was for this reason that Cyril forcefully and resolutely affirmed that between the human and divine nature of Christ there exists more than a harmony or link (συνάφεια); there is a true union (ἑνωσι). The better to mark its reality he calls it union in the hypostasis *(secundum hypostasim,* καθ' ὑπόστασιν), not in the sense that he supposes a new hypostasis, but because the union is accomplished in the pre-existing hypostasis of the Word.* Ina less happy expression he also calls it *unio secundum "naturam"* (ἑνωσι κατά οὐσιν, or ἑνωσι φυσική) not because a new nature results from it (nature-*person,* φὐσι)2, but because human nature is possessed mysteriously by the Word Incarnate in Whom it is a single φὐσι (independent nature), the nature of God. The human nature of the Saviour, although complete 3, is not a φὐσι 4 in the full meaning of the word, which to Cyril's mind comprises independent existence *in se,* that is a personal character. Thus the Bishop of Alexandria prefers to speak of the single "nature" (yia φὐσι) of Christ.

Saint Cyril's favourite and most famous formula is μια φὐσι του θεού Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη 5. The meaning of this has been explained above. Cyril never abandoned this expression. It may be asked why be was so much attached to it. First, because he thought it was due to Saint Athanasius, whereas in reality it was from the pen of Apollinaris, but generally repeated on the authority of the great defender of the

'See J. Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* III, 68. Sonic authors think that the expressions ἑνωσι καθ' ὑπόστασιν, κατά φὐσιν, signify merely a real union. But in spite of his philosophical shortcomings, it would seem that a theologian like St. Cyril must have meant more than that in his use of these expressions.

* Even less did he suppose a " theandric nature ".

3 He rejected Apollinarianism.

4 He calls Christ's humanity *caro, propria caro, humanitas, humanum,* το καθ' ήμα , etc. This humanity is not φὐσι , but ιδιότη ή κατά φὐσιν *(proprietas natura)* or ποιότη φυσική *(qualitas natura).*

5 *Una natura* (nature;*person) Dei Verbi Incarnata.* See *ddv. Nest. blaph.,* li; *Epist.* 40, 46.

Nicene faith. On the other hand, he had to combat Nestorius, who, preaching two natures, retained no more than a moral personality uniting them. "Lastly, let it be said, for it is clear", says 'fixeront', "Cyril does not perceive how a nature, in the proper sense of the word, could exist without a hypostasis. He was struck by the principle put forward by Theodore of Mopsuestia" that a complete nature is a hypostasis. He is faced with mystery. But instead of modifying it to agree with his philosophy, as did Apollinaris and Theodore, he recognised that for us the unity of Jesus Christ is properly an incomprehensible and unutterable mystery. Moreover, he remarks, we can put no limit to the divine power. *Tradition,* which in practice teaches us the personal unity of Christ, had more authority in Cyril's eyes than all the objections of philosophy.

Saint Cyril liked to explain his teaching on the union of the divine and human nature in the Incarnation by means of the union between the body and soul in man -. This comparison is well suited to mark the real nature of the union and also the lack of confusion in the elements that are united and which remain distinct in spite of the closeness of their union. This, however, was no more than a comparison and Cyril did not conclude that either or both the associated elements were incomplete, or that a new theandric nature resulted from the union. The Monophysites went that far and travestied his ideas, and similarly abused his famous expression: μία φύσι . In spite of appearances they had no grounds for claiming that their doctrine derived from Cyril.

By his defence of the personal unity of the Man-God, Saint Cyril definitely established the traditional doctrine of the communication of idioms \ It was usual with him to attribute to the Incarnate Word the actions, passions and properties of one and the other natures ; further, he attributed, in the union of the two, the actions of the divine or human nature to the other, and affirmed the propriety *of* this procedure4.

Saint Cyril was the great protagonist of the divine motherhood of Mary 5. He maintained the integrity of this privilege and rejected the diminution of Θεοτόκο to Θεοδόχο (Vessel of God) or Χο'.στοτόκο (mother of Christ). He thus contributed in a great degree to the rapid development of the devotion to Mary, after the Council of Ephesus. He himself in his ivth homily of Ephesus sang the dignity of Mary in magnificent passages which were later borrowed again and again by preachers and poets, especially on the occasion of feasts of Our Eady, which became more and

1 *Mélanges,* p. 217. See above, p. 13.
3 See M. JUGIE, *Nestori»:,* p. 169 sq.
3 *Adv. Nest. bias?.,* 1, 6; II, 3; IV, 6; etc.
4 In practice, however, to avoid making a distinct person of the man, "he was always careful not to postulate the human nature of Christ as the *direct subject* of the actions or passions of Jesus Christ. It is the Word that acts and suffers action, "σαρα·. rather than the man. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dorm.,* m n. 71-72.
~ See the treatises mentioned on this subject. ' ' 1 * 3 4 7

more frequent after the VIth century. The title of All Holy (Παναγία), completing those of Θεοτόκο and αειπάρθενο (ever a virgin), summed up for the piety of the Eastern Church the whole of traditional theology, and it is not without grounds that it is seen to include the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception [1]. The considerable part played by Cyril in these developments should not be forgotten [2].

C) Sanctifying Grace and Christian Life.

The early Doctors, following in the traces of Saint Paul, were fond of speaking to the faithful of the "divine life" they possessed and which made of them the heirs to heaven. They found this teaching to be an antidote against the passions as much as an encouragement to a more perfect life. Saint Cyril, ever traditional in his teaching, repeated what the early Doctors [3] had taught, but "he repeated in his own way, impressing it with the mark of his own personality. He brought together and welded into a system the data which before him had been scattered; he linked up the whole, better than it had ever been done before, to the Trinitarian doctrine and Christology. At the same time his ardent piety inspired him to express his faith in a way never before equalled for its boldness and truth" [4].

10 Like the early Fathers, he regarded the sanctification of man as purification, a passage from death to life, a rebirth, a return to the original state lost by sin, a renewal of the interior man, a profound transformation of the soul, and lastly as a deification. This last characteristic especially retained his attention [5]. The soul is made again in the image of God, Who impresses His likeness on it as if by a seal, and "this imprint of the Divinity is so real, so deep, that we become, thanks to it, partakers in the divine nature, θεία κοινωνοι χύσεω , according to the expression in II *Pet.* 1, 4. We are

1 Taking into account the precisions added by theologians and preachers. A synopsis of their teaching is to be found in M. Jugie, *Immaculée Conception,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 904-936.

* See Vol. I, *Doctrinal Index,* n. 65 sq.

2 Nevertheless, remarks Fr. Jugie, "the Marial teaching contained in the authentic writings of Saint Cyril does not add anything to that of the fourth century Greek Fathers. Saint Cyril still supposes that Mary, on seeing Jesus crucified, had doubts, and perhaps no idea at all, of His resurrection". *Op. cit.,* col. 905.

4 J. Mahé, *La sanctification, op. cit.,* p. 31.

5 See quotation in J.-B. Terrien, *La grâce et la gloire,* passim.

truly deified. No doubt we do not become gods *by nature* y.a.'zb. ọὐσιν; we are not changed into the divine nature, but while still retaining our weakness and our humanity, we really receive something divine which raises us above our nature " l.*

The Holy Ghost is the especial principle of our sanctification. The whole Trinity, of course, works this sanctification, but through the Holy Ghost, " which is its *Perfume,* or *quality* or sanctifying power, " the "*fire* that burns up our stains," the "fortifying *chrism,*" the "*living spring* which renders fertile for eternal life, " the "*seal impressed* (in souls) to restore to them the divine likeness" '. Like all the Fathers of the fourth century Saint Cyril proves the divinity of the Holy Ghost from this *sanctifying action.* The Holy Ghost sanctifies; He is therefore holy by nature, therefore He is God. The Holy Ghost deifies, He is therefore God. There must be light to spread light, fire to spread fire; God therefore to render us partakers of the divine nature. The Holy Ghost, Who is God, is joined to the soul which He sanctifies by a simple moral union, a relative but nevertheless real union, extremely close and fruitful, just as He was united to the first man. Thus it is that man is " deified ".

The humanity of Christ was joined to the Word by an essentially ' different union ; but it also was sanctified by the Holy Ghost. But it was the Word Himself Who worked this sanctification by sending the Spirit, which is His Spirit. Moreover, this Spirit was received in Christ's humanity only *that it might be communicated to us,* so that the gift that man had lost through sin might be restored to him. Christ communicated His Spirit after the Resurrection ; the prophets themselves were unable to receive it4. In such manner is the dignity of the Christian superior to that of the early patriarchs.

Perhaps this latter affirmation should not be taken literally, but should be understood as referring to the inferiority of the Old Testament, which conferred grace only in virtue of the New to which it was essentially ordained 5. All theologians, however, do not accept this favourable interpretation 6. Their disagreement is more serious on another question : docs not Saint Cyril teach that there is a *personal union* of the Holy Ghost with holy souls? Is the Holy Ghost *formal* principle of justification or only the efficient cause? Lastly, is sanctification *proper* to the Holy Ghost?

It is certain that Cyril thought that the whole Trinity came to dwell in the sanctified soul. At the same time that he becomes the temple ol the Holy Ghost, the Christian becomes the brother of Jesus Christ and

l J. Mahé, *ibid.,* p. 3S.
• J. Mahé, *ibid.,* p. 37-38.
1 Nestorius admitted only a différence of degree.
4 See *In Ev. Joann. : P. G.,* 73, 756-757·
5 See Terrien, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 227-281.
e According to Petau *(De Trinitate,* VIH, 7), St. Cyril recognised in the Old Testament only an *a. live* presence ενέργειαν) of the Holy Ghost in the just, reserving to the New the perfect *substantial* presence (κατ' ουσιαν) or indwelling.

the adopted son of the Father. But it may be wondered whether the Holy Ghost is the only intermediary, and whether it is not with Him *directly* and without any created grace that this union is accomplished. Affirmations very favourable to this sense on the part of the Greek Fathers, and especially Saint Cyril, caused Peter Lombard [1] in the Middle Ages and Petau [2] at a later date, who although not denying the existence of a created grace admitted —mistakenly basing himself on Cyril[3]—a substantial union (οὐσιώδη) of the Holy Ghost with the soul,[4][5] and, what is more, attributed sanctification *solely*[6] to the Holy Ghost. In reality the texts of the Bishop of Alexandria can be sufficiently explained by *appropriation,* [6] provided that they are referred to and based upon the Greek conception of the Trinity,[7] when we seek for the analogies existing between justification and the personal attributes of the Holy Ghost : analogies which are the true basis of appropriation.

2° Saint Cyril's teaching on sanctifying grace revealed the true fountain head of Christian life, as also did that of Saint Augustine in the West, though from another point of view. In refuting Pelagius, the Bishop of Hippo, without in any way neglecting sanctifying habitual grace, was obliged to stress actual grace and recall the need of divine action on the human will in the practice of virtue and the attainment of true holiness. The Bishop of Alexandria showed rather the nature and greatness of this Christian holiness by connecting it with the substantial holiness of God, of which it isa participation[8]. Both these aspects find their source in Saint Paul and are, both the one and the other, equally apt to lead the Christian to the practice of perfection.

The Eucharist, the nourishment of Christian life, has a large place in Saint Cyril's thought: " It cures the sickness of the soul, it curbs within us the law of the flesh, excites our piety towards God, mortifies the passions, binds up the hurts of the wounded, delivers us from the attacks and the tyranny of the devil. Hence the necessity of receiving Communion,

1 Who wrongly denied the existence of a created grace. *Sent.,* I, *disi.* XVII.

7 *De Tt initate,* vin, 4-7.

' J. Mahé, *op. cit.,* p. 471-473·

4 Against this doctrine, see De Regnon, *Etudes sur la Triniti,* t. IV, P 537-539·

5 Petau s opinion, however, is hardly consistent here, and sometimes seems to mean *appropriation.*

6 Nevertheless, even in modern times, Petau's teaching has been defended by various authors, Schrader, Schreeben and especially Juvène, S. J., Professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris, in his *De vita hominum deiformi,* 1880-1881 (lithographed course), th. XIX.

7 See J. Mahé, *op. cit.,* p. 478-480.

" He recognised, moreover, the necessity of actual grace without which we can accomplish nothing.

and the obligation, in order to be worthy of it, of leading a pure and truly Christian life"[1]. The two outstanding features, however, of his Eucharistic teaching are the two points he defended against Nestorius: i. e., that the Eucharistic Body of Christ is a life-giving food, since it is physically united to the Word, Who is the Life, and furthermore that the communicant unites himself directly and physically to the Word by partaking of this flesh. This union is inferior to the hypostatic union, but superior to the Nestorian union. Cyril does not admit the dilemma: flesh *or* divinity[2]. In the Eucharist, as in the Incarnation, the two are physically united. The whole of Saint Cyril's doctrine is in that phrase.

CHAPTER III.

Theodoret of Cyrus,

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions: *P. G.,* 80-84 (Schultze-Noesselt's edition, 1768-1775).

2. Studies: TILLemont, *Mémoires,* xv, Paris, 1711, p. 207-340. P. Foresi', *Un évêque du siècle, Théodoret de Cyr,* in *Université Catholique,* 1901 (t. XXXVil), p. 161-183. L. SALTET, *Les sources de* Z'Ερανιστή *de Théodoret,* in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1905 (t. vi), p. 289-303, 513-536, 741-754. A. Bertram, *Theodoreti ep. Cyrensis doctrina Christalogica,* Hildesiæ, 1883. J. Schulte, *Theodoret von Cyrus ais apologet,* Vienna, 1904. J. Lebreton, *Le doçme de la transsubstantiation et la théologie antiochienne au Ve siècle,* in *Etudes,* 1908 (t. 117), P· 477-497·

I. THEODORET'S LIFE AND WORKS.

Theodoret is the last great representative of the School of Antioch, as Saint Cyril, who was for many years his adversary, was the last representative of the School of Alexandria[3]. Much inferior to the latter as regards theological scholarship and firmess of Christian instinct, he surpasses him as a writer and exegete. Reacting against Cyril's tendencies, he let his own carry him to the extreme limits of

[1] L Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* hi, p. 224. Cf. *In hoinn.,* vi, 2 - 7.
[2] P. Battifol, *of>. cit.,* p. 474·
[3] For these two Schools see Vol. 1, p. 297-300.

orthodoxy, and perhaps at the beginning even went beyond them. He made up for this fault later when he had the honour to be the first to denounce Monophysitism. The services he rendered to the faith, however, did not altogether redeem his momentary error, for the Church never honoured him as a Saint, in spite of the very real virtues he undoubtedly possessed.

Theodoret was born at Antioch, probably about 393 r, of wealthy parents, who gave him a thorough Christian and literary education. He frequented the schools of his native town, which were still under the influence of Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia. He had as co-disciples Nestorius and John, the future patriarch of Antioch. He formed a close friendship with both, a friendship which was destined at times to pervert his judgment and drag him into unfortunate controversies. Although naturally delicate and sensitive, he was first to the fore whenever the faith was threatened. Attracted by the contemplative life, he entered the religious life at Nicerte, near Antioch, about 416. About 423, however, in spite of his youth, he was raised to the See of Cyrus, in Osrhoene near the Euphrates, where he spent more than thirty years.

He proved to be a zealous bishop, and showed enormous energy in carrying out his pastoral duties in his vast diocese of more than 800 villages, spread over a region of very difficult communications. He worked hard for the conversion of the Pagans and heretics who were many in these districts, and in 449 was able to write to the pope, Saint Leo:1 "Aided by God's grace, I have cured more than a thousand souls of Marcion's sickness, and have brought back a multitude of others from the camp of Arius and Eunomius to the flock of Jesus Christ Our Lord Nor did this labour ot apostleship prevent him from being a great intellectual worker, as witness his writings which reveal him as an exegete, orator, apologist, theologian and historian.

His works on the Scriptures are perhaps the most extensive part of this work. In addition to the didactic treatises, in the form of *questions and answers,* on the historical books of the Old Testament (Octateuch 3—Pentateuch,

1 Others incline to the year 386.
3 *Epist.* 113.
'P. 6*., 80, 75-52S.

Josué, Judges, Ruth—the Books of Kings and the Paralipomena) x, we have extant four important series of commentaries: *a)* on the Psalms;1* /;) on the Canticle of Canticles;3 on all the Prophets;4 *d)* lastly, on all Saint Paul's Epistles 5. Theodoret was one of the most gifted exegetes of the early Church. His work, written in a pure and elegant style bears witness to the thorough education he had received at Antioch, the qualities of his clear and methodical mind and his great power of assimilation. It is unfortunately somewhat lacking in originality, and the author himself confesses that he preferred to bring together all the best ideas of the School of Antioch rather than compose a personal work. Fortunately, in spite of his esteem for Theodore of Mopsuestia, he kept clear of his influence and avoided his dangerous excursions.

Theodoret was a notable preacher and often came to Antioch from his distant diocese, where he was in great request. Nearly all his sermons, however, are now lost. There remains, together with various fragments 6, only a large portion of 5 sermons on *Saint John Chrysostom* 7 and a series of 10 discourses on *Providence* 8, which are apologetical in tone. To his oratorical work may be added the writing on *holy and divine charity* 9 which forms an appendix to the History of the Monks.

Theodoret's chief apologetic work is his famous treatise, *"Remedy for the Diseases of the Greeks of* which the contents are indicated in the sub-title : " Understanding of the Truth of the Gospels by the Philosophy of the Greeks". In this long work in twelve books (written from 429 to 437) the author treats of a number of vital theological and philosophical questions, such as the origin of man, his nature, the world, etc.; and opposes to the Pagan solutions the Christian answer, which corrects, completes and perfects that of the early philosophers.

A number of Theodoret's theological writings on the Trinity and the Incarnation are extant; but several others, mentioned in his correspondence, which were composed

l *P.* G.. 80, <527-858. — » *p. G.*. 80, S57-1998.
3 *P. G.,* 81, 27-284. — ‹ *P. G.,* 81, 215-199S.
s *P. G.,* 82, 35-878. — « *P. G„* 84, 53-64-
7 *P. G.,* 84, 47-54- — 8 *P. G.,* 83, 555'774-
' *P. G.,* 82, 1497-1552.
>*P. G.,* 83, 783-1152.

for the purpose of combating heretics (Marcionites, Eunomians, Macedonians, Apollinarists) are lost.

Two of the remaining ones have been preserved under Saint Cyril's name: *De sancta et vivifica Trinitate* and *De Incarnatione Domini**. Three others were written during the Christological controversy ; from the outset Theodoret took up a firm stand against Cyril in the *Reprehensio XII Anathematismorum CyrilID,* and in *Pentalogtum de Incarnalione*\ and later denounced Monophysitism in the Eranistes[1] These important theological writings will be studied below.

Theodoret's reputation has been chiefly maintained by his historical writings, although they form but the smaller part of his work. All these writings were composed towards the end of his career :

1. His History of the monks[6], written about 440, is a collection of very animated accounts of the most famous Eastern ascetics, and contains as an appendix a little treatise, or rather a splendid discourse " on divine and holy charity"[7] in monastic life.

2. The Ecclesiastical History[8], from 323 to 428, written about 445, to complete that of Eusebius, is not merely a plagiarism of Socrates and Sozomen's histories, as is usually averred. Theodoret was acquainted with the latter, but he composed a really original work, not only because as a Christian and bishop he was a better judge than these two laymen and was better able to stress the events and persons who contributed to the triumph of orthodoxy[9],[10] but also because he had access to fresh and first-class documents, such as letters, mémoires and conciliar acts, on all of which he drew to a great extent. He evinced a special interest in the patriarchate of Antioch.

3. Finally, about 453, he composed an abridged. History of heresies [10], which, in the first four books, outlines the history of heresies from Simon Magus to the errors current in the author's own time (the chapter dealing with Nestorius is probably due to another hand); book v contains as a conclusion a synoptic explanation of Christian morality and dogma.

1 *P. G.,* 75> H47-II90· Another little writing in Latin is still extant: *De Trinitate, P. G.,* 83, 1167-1172.

2 *P. G.,* 75» I4i9'i478. J. Lebon confirms the attribution of this and the preceding work to Theodoret; and restores to the same author the *Expositio recta fidei* which bears Justinian's name. See *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1930, p. 523-550.

' P. *G.,* 76, 385-432.

4 *P. G.,* 84, 65-88 (fragments).

s Λ *G.,* 83, 27-336.

6 *Religiosa historia seu ascetica vivendi ratio* (Φιλόθεο ιστορία ή ασκητική πο/ιτεία) *P. Z.,* 82, 1283-1496.

7 See above, p. 42.

8 *P. G.,* 82, 881-1280. New edition, L. Parmentier, Leipzig, 1911 (In *Corpus of Berlin).*

9 Which is not a perversion of history or a "pious fraud" as Parmentier supposes.

10 *Hereticarum fabularum compendium : P. L.,* 83, 335-556.

CHAPTER III.

Theodoret's correspondence, which comprises almost 230 letters [1], provides great historical interest as well as an insight into the author's character: " The nobility and fineness of the ideas, the elegance of the style, the modesty of scholarship, all in this correspondence has always provoked universal praise", says Bardenhewer[2]. It forms one of the most precious sources of information regarding the theological discussions of the time.

II. THEODORET AND THE CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY.

Theodoret's doctrinal influence is chiefly connected with the then rising Christological controversies. We will therefore disregard other aspects [3] of his doctrinal activities the better to study this more important one.

It would seem that Theodoret was drawn into the Nestorian controversies both by his friendship for the Bishop of Constantinople and his personal convictions. In 430 he advised Nestorius to submit to the Pope, but when Saint Cyril's anathematisms appeared, he thought them tainted with Apollinarianism and criticised them in a treatise which is probably entirely preserved in Saint Cyril's rejoinder *(Apologia contra Theodoreturn)* At the Council of Ephesus he sided with John of Antioch. Soon afterwards he again attacked Cyril and the Council in a great work in 5 books (lost, except for fragments), the *Pentalogium de Incarnatione.* His opuscula on the Trinity and the Incarnation appeared at the same period. In 443, for personal rather than doctrinal reasons he refused to subscribe to the formula of union which he had nevertheless inspired and perhaps drawn up. He did not adhere to it until 435, and for long afterwards refused to condemn Nestorius. Shortly afterwards (438) he even sponsored the cause of Theodore of Mopsuestia against Saint

1 To the 181 letters edited in *P. G.,* 83, 1173-1494, must be added another 48 edited in 1885 by J. Sakkelion at Athens.

2 *Patrologie,* II, p. 239.

1 We would mention only a special conception of the Eucharist found in his work, although it was not new to the School of Antioch: it consists in the coexistence of bread and flesh, of wine and blood in the Eucharist, and this Eucharistic diphysitism helped in establishing Christological diphysitism and perhaps the duality of persons. See P. BATIFFOL, *L'Eucharistie,* p. 454 sq. J. Lebreton, *op. cit.*

4 On this treatise and the following see above, p. 28.

Cyril, who was then conducting a campaign against this true father of Nestorianism [1].

Meanwhile a very real Monophysitism, fraudulently based on the Council of Ephesus and the authority of the Bishop of Alexandria, was making great progress. Theodoret in 447 was one of the first to denounce it in a work called *Eranistes* (the Beggar), also called the Versatile (πολύμορφος); and in reality the author does no more than show up a teaching which is but a collection of follies begged from the early heretics; a myth in many forms. The book comprises: first, three dialogues, showing that the Word Incarnate suffered no change in His divine nature (ἄτρεπτος, *immutatus)* that in Him there was no confusion of the divine and human (ἀσύγχυτος, *inconfusus),* that He is impassible (ἀπαθής, *impassibilis);* in a fourth book the discussion is summed up in the form of a didactic treatise.

Such a writing was bound to arouse the hate of the Monophysites against Theodoret. They had him deposed at the Robber Council of Ephesus (44.9) and shut up in his old monastery at Nicerte. From there he appealed to the Pope in a very explicit letter on the universal primacy of the See of Rome, which is the See of Peter: "It is in every way fitting that you should hold the first place"[2]. He was convoked to the Council of Chalcedon in spite of Monophysite protests, and was rehabilitated and restored to his See by the Pope's legates and the Emperor, but only after he had condemned and anathematised Nestorius and his teaching: "Anathema to Nestorius, anathema to whoever refuses the title of Mother of God to the Blessed Virgin Mary and divides the only Son of God into two"[3]. The Council answered this frank and solemn declaration by calling the Bishop of Cyrus by the title of "Catholic Doctor". Theodoret died in 485 in communion with the Church.

He had been too much involved in theological strife for his reputation not to have suffered. His works against Saint Cyril and the Council of Ephesus formed one of the *Three Chapters* which Justinian endeavoured to have

[1] See above, p. 32.

[2] *Epist.* 113 *(Inter Epist. S. Leonis,* 52. *P. L.,* 54, 847-854). *Cf.* P. Batiffol, *Le Siège apostolique,* p. 517-519. See below, p. 55.

[3] Mansi, vii, 189.

condemned in 543-553 in order to gain Monophysite support for the Empire. He was successful in 553 at the second Council of Constantinople (Vth Oecumenical) which was approved by Pope Vigilius in 554 x. The Council, however, did not condemn Theodoret personally nor cast doubt on the sincerity of his intentions.

What must be thought of Theodoret's orthodoxy in the Christological controversy? Was he truly a Nestorian in his struggle with Saint Cyril, or did he only misunderstand his rival's system? The early Fathers in general considered that he erred. Bertram brings his study to an end with these words : " At the outset the Bishop of Cyrus really shared Nestorius' error; it was only later that he threw if off; perhaps about 436". 'fixeront admits this conclusion, but considers that it should be considerably modified: "Theodoret", he says, " undoubtedly approved the energetic diphysitism of Nestorius ", and gave it expression with the help of "incorrect formulas and exaggerated expressions"; it would be too much, however, to make of him, "even at the outset, a conscious Nestorian, admitting two persons in Jesus Christ" 2. It has even been said that Providence raised him up as a useful offset to his rival, and also as a barrier against the heretical thrusts of his own friends. It can al least be said that he partly obtained this twofold result, but since the faith had been defined in a Council approved by Rome he was gravely culpable in attacking this sovereign authority. He made up for it in his latter years.

CHAPTER IV.

Syriac Literature in and after the Vth Century.

Special Bibliography :

R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque,* Paris, 1899 (3rd ed. 1907). A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur,* Bonn, 1922, p. 100-139. J. LabouRT, *Le christianisme dans Vempire perse,* Paris, 1904. M. J. LAGRANGE, *Un évêque syrien du Ve siècle; Rabulas, évêque d'Edesse,* in *Mélanges d'histoire religieuse,* Paris, 1915. V. Grumel, *Un théologien nestorien, Babai le Grand* (VIe-VIIe siècle), dans *Echos d'Orient,'* 1923 (t. XXII), p. 153-181, 257-280; 1924 (t. XXIII), p. 9-33, 162-177, 257-274, 395*399- J· 'Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* III, p. 53 60.

l See below, p. 86.
-J. Tixerost, *Hist. Dogai.,* ni, p. 102-103.

I. THE SCHOOL OF EDESSA.

The School of Edessa, which had shown such brilliant promise in the fourth century with Saint Ephraem,[1] did not escape the Nestorian contamination in the fifth century and gradually fell into decay. It survived only in the frankly heretical School of Nisibis.

The chief intellectual centre of Middle Syria[2] was this famous *School of Edessa,* also called the *School of the Persians* because of the number of young Persian Christians who crossed the frontier in order to acquire, with the Syrians, a sounder religious education. The Antiochian Doctors, especially Theodore of Mopsuestia, were held in great esteem at Edessa. After the Council of Ephesus, however, the Bishop, Rabulas[3] (435), at last realised the clangers of this influence. He denounced Theodore to Saint Cyril and himself proscribed the heretic with great rigour. But in vain. Both the School and the clergy demurred to him, but only in appearance. The general state of mind is well seen in a letter written in 433 by *Ibas,* a priest of Edessa, to *Moris* (the name or title of the Bishop of Ardashir-i, Seleucia in Persia). This letter relates the happenings at the Council of Ephesus and the reconciliation of Cyril and John of Antioch, in a manner extremely partial to Nestorius; together with very orthodox expressions, it contains many ambiguous ones; especially did it attack Saint Cyril and Rabulas, and judged their zeal against Theodore as being out of place.

On the death of Rabulas in 435, Ibas[5] became Bishop of Edessa. He allowed the free propagation of Theodore's writings and was in consequence accused of Nestorianism (447). Like Theodoret he was deposed at the *Robber Council* of Ephesus (449) and likewise rehabilitated at Chalcedon in 451, after having anathematised Nestorius. No decision was taken by the majority of the Council on the orthodoxy

1 See Vol. 1, p. 378.

2 For the divisions of Syria, see λΓο1. I, p. 375.

3 See Vol. 1, p. 385.

4 The Bishop of Ardashir (Seleucia-Ctesiphon), Patriarch of the Chaldeans, was at this time Dadiso. Did he also bear the name of Maris? M. Labourt considers that this latter word is probably the literal transcription of the title of Lord *(Mari)* given to bishops. *Op. cit.,* p. 133-134, 254 sq.

5 Ibas or Ilibha. See *ibid.,* p. 256-261.

of his letter. He occupied the Sec of Edessa for several more years. On his death in 457, the School lost a great number of its professors, followers of Nestorius, who went to Nisibis in Persia [1]. The School, thus mutilated, lingered on for another twenty years. It was finally shut down in the year 489 by order of the Emperor Zeno. The masters and pupils went to join the first group already established at Nisibis.

II. THE SCHOOL OF NISIBIS.

The real founders of the School of Nisibis, to which was due the final triumph of heresy in the Chaldean Christian countries, were Barsumas and Narses, two ardent Nestorians, both emigrants from Persia.

Barsumas [2] left sermons, hymns, letters and a liturgy to posterity, but he is chiefly remembered for his zeal in spreading Nestorianism in Persia. This he achieved both by his teaching and by his political manœuvres. Having become Bishop of Nisibis, he founded the Schools in that town, in imitation of that of Edessa, drew up its first statutes and placed Narses at its head. At the same time he persuaded the Pagan king, Petoses (457-484) to recognise Nestorianism and to proscribe another Christian sect suspected of complicity with the Emperor of Byzantium. Henceforth the Nestorian Church had its Primate (catholicos) at Seleucia-Ctesiphon [4]. It flourished,and spread Christianity throughout eastern Asia, even as far as China.

Narses [5] was, for the space of 50 years until his death, the soul of the School oi Nisibis, which through his influence became the headquarters of Nestorian propaganda. Pie enjoyed great authority among his own followers, who called him the *Harp* of the *Holy Ghost,* whilst by his enemies he was called the *Leper.* Among his works may be mentioned:

1. Metrical homilies (360 according to Ebedjesu);
2. commentaries (on a great part of the Bible);

[1] Mgr. Duchesne puts this exodus in 449-450. *Hist. Ane. Êgl.,* in, 568.
[2] See J. Labourt, *op. cit.,* p. 131-152.
[3] On the School of Nisibis, see J. Labourt, *op. cit.,* p. 391-301.
[4] There was also perhaps a theological school at Seleucia from the Vth century J. Labourt, *op. cit.,* p. 290.
[5] See J. Labourt, *op. cit.,* p. 263 sq.

3. a liturgy and an explanation of the (Eucharistic) mysteries;

4. a treatise on " the corruption of manners

With him the School tended even more to a full hypostatic dualism. At the outset it had been content with the formula of union of 433; but gradually even this formula came to be regarded with suspicion. In one of his homilies (485-490) it is rejected by Narses, together with the Council of Ephesus, while great praise is given to the Doctors of Nestorianism, Diodorus, Theodore and Nestorius [1]

In the sixth century the School showed a tendency towards Catholicism. This inclination was apparent in Mar-Aba[2], future Bishop and Primate of Seleucia from 540 to 552, and even more in Henana[3], a famous and popular professor, Grand Master of the University from 572, who died in 610. In spite of many condemnations he was successful in retaining his position, supported by the upper classes and the majority of the students. According to his adversaries, he was heterodox on three heads; as a Chaldean or magician, as an Origenist, and especially in Christology as opposing Theodore of Mopsuestia and admitting the hypostatic union and the Θεοτόκο[4]. He also believed in original sin as did the Catholics. The opposition to his teaching and the schism to which it gave rise was chiefly due to Babai the Great, who gave a definite form to Nestorianism.

III. OFFICIAL DOCTRINE OF THE NESTORIAN CHURCH.

Babai[4] (550-627), the Superior of the great monastery of Abraham on Mount Izia, played a very prominent part at the beginning of the seventh century, and unified the Nestorians, who were becoming more and more at variance through schism and doctrinal divergencies. In consequence a grateful Church gave him the title of *Great.* " Without other official title than inspector of monasteries,... Babai scoured the country, inspiring courage and strengthening flagging energies. He was above all the vigilant guardian of

[1] Published in the *Journal asiatique,* 1899, by F. Martin.

[2] On Mar-Aba see J. Labourt, *op. cit.,* p. 162-191; and on his teaching, p. 267-268.

[3] On Henana and his followers see J. Labourt, *op. cit.,* Ch. vili and xi. See especially, p. 214-216, 278-280.

[4] On Babai see chiefly J. Labourt, *op. cit.,* 229-230, 280-287.

(Nestorian) orthodoxy, seeking out heretics, even in the most distant monasteries, and fighting their sly propaganda with all his force... In order to combat the Henamans, the Messallians and the Monophysites, he had recourse more than once to the Christian officers at Port Royal, with whom he kept in close touch. No one seems to have doubted his authority among his co-religionaries"[1]. It is said that he was elected Primate about 627, but refused this dignity. He died shortly afterwards, leaving a somewhat large number of works, commentaries, hymns and theological treatises few of which, however, are extant[2]. His principal work is the treatise *De Unione*[3], which explains his dogmatic teaching in Christology.

There is no doubt that Babai taught Nestorianism, although he made use of new expressions modified in a Catholic sense[4]. He considered that the Antiochian formulas of *adhesion, indwelling and assumption,* used to signify the union of two natures in Christ, were insufficient. He admits that Mary is the Mother of God, and insists on the personal unity of the Saviour. But this language can be misleading. On the other hand he attributed two natures and two hypostases to the Man-God, and these two natures or hypostases are exactly what we would term *two persons;*[5]. "His single personality is no more than a moral being, not suppressing but supposing, on the contrary, and protecting the radical ontological duality of the two elements which constitute Christ... These natures are always presented as two perfect existing beings, enjoying their ontological

1 *Ibid.,* p. 230.

3 The only extant writings are :

a) Various moral and liturgical opuscula ;

b) Commentarii in set mones abbatis Marci;

i) *Martyrium Georgi* (Edit. Bedjan, Paris, 1S95) ;

<7) *Expositio libri Centuriarum* of Evagrius Ponticus; edit. Frankenburg, Berlin, 1912. See Vol. 1, p. 999.

e) Liber de Unione (see the following note), with another opusculum in the appendix on the same subject.

3 Edit., A. Vasciiai.de, Paris, 1915 *(Scriptores Syri),* See V. Grumel's long study on the treatrise, mentioned above.

4 See J. Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 58-60. V. Grumel, *op. cit.*

5 Bahai makes the following distinctions: the abstract nature (kianâ) ; the concrete and individual substance which he identifies with the hypostasis called qnoumà; the special "property" which makes the hypostasis a distinct person (parsopá). This property appears to be no more than a group of accidental qualities.

independence *a pan.* There is always question of two subjects of attribution " ». Babai hardly did more than transpose the basic error of his Church 2 into orthodox and Catholic terminology as Nestorius had done before him in his *Book of Heraclides.* This teaching, which was codified in the national Councils, has scarcely varied since the seventh century.

The Acts of the Councils of the Nestorian Church have been made known in great detail in modern times through the publication of a very important document, the Synodicon Orientales. This consists of a collection, probably made in the ninth century, of the Acts of thirteen synods, Nestorian for the most part 4, of which the most important date from the period at present under discussion. This collection is extremely valuable for the information it gives regarding ecclesiastical discipline in these early Christian communities: it determines many points in the chronology of the patriarchs and religious history; but its chief merit lies in the fact that an inspection of the professions of faith with which many of the synods were opened, allows us to follow the successive modifications of the Nestorian doctrine. The Nestorian Church thus isolated from the rest of Catholic Christendom formed but a small portion of the Christian population of Syria. Another portion, of greater importance, was to be torn away from Catholicism by the Monophysite heresy. See the following chapter.

' V. Grumel, *op. cit.,* 1924, p. 273-274.

9 Nor does his error consist only in his solution of the Christological problem ; it is also found in the way he envisages the question, as Fr. Grumel rightly remarks. *Ibid.* The Nestorians begin by accentuating the Antiochian tendencies, and then suppose two beings ontologically distinct ; having done this they seek to show how they can form a single Christ.

3 *Synodicon Orientale,* or *Recueil de synodes nestoriens,* published, translated and annotated by J. B. Chabot, Paris, 1902. See on this work, J. Forget, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1914 (t. V), p. 91-96. H. Leclercq, *Hist, des conciles,* II, 1271-1301.

4 The first three are earlier; those of the Patriarchs, Isaac in 410, Yahbalana I in 420, Dadjesu in 424 (rather than in 430 as Duval thought). See Vol. 1, p. 3S5.

CHAPTER V.

Monophysitism.

Special Bibliography :

A. Michel, *Hypostatique (Union),* in *Diet. théol.,* col. 477-487. M. Jugie, *Eutyches et Eutychianisme,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1582-1609; *Gaïanite (controverse),* col. 1002-1023. J. Bois, *Chalcedoine (Cone, de),* col. 2190-2210. S. Salaville, *Hénotique,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2153-2178, and in *Echos dOrient,* 1918· 1920. J. LEBON, *Le monophysisme sévérien* (thesis), Louvain, 1909; *La Christologie de Timothée Ælure,* in *Rev. Hist.Eccl.,* 1908 (t. IX), p. 677-702. R. DRAGUet, *Julien dHalicarnasse* (thesis), Louvain, 1924; *Julien dHalic.,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1931-1940. G. Voisin, *Eapollinarisme* (thesis), Louvain, 1901. F. Nau, *Dans quelle mesure les Jacobites sont-ils monophysites?* in *Rev. Or. chrét.,* 1905 (t. x), p. 113-134. J. 'Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 80-129. See also J. Pargoire,/JAî/7/^ *byzantine,* p. 23 sq. HEFELE-LECLERCQ, *Hist, des Conciles,* t. 11, 499-951. Mgr. Duchesne, *EEglise au VIe siècle,* Paris, 1925.

I. ORIGINS OF MONOPHYSITISM. EUTYCHES.

The need of combating Nestorius had led Saint Cyril to employ expressions which threw into relief the real and physical character of the union of the two natures in Jesus Christ. These expressions, however, were dangerous; especially μία φύσ'. τού Θεού Λόγου σεσαοκωμένη. They were easily susceptible of false interpretation, either on the part of the ignorant (such was the case of *Eutyches)* or on the part of the unscrupulous, more intent on their own interests than on truth (such was the case of *Dioscurus,* Cyril's successor) *.

Eutyches, born about 378, was from the age of thirty (408) archimandrite of the great monastery of three hundred monks at Constantinople. After the Council of Ephesus he became an ardent adversary of the Nestorians. In 441, when his godson, the eunuch Chrysaphius, came into power, he became all powerful at Byzantium; he used his new-found authority vigorously against all suspected of Nestorianism. Unfortunately, his was "an obtuse mind, shallow and lacking in suppleness, and quite without any solid theological

* See below, p. 63.

culture"; Saint Leo calls him *imprudens et nimis imperitus* [1]. He clung to Saint Cyril's formulas without understanding them, holding to the letter rather than the spirit, and treated as heretics all who were not so literal as himself. He roused much opposition. He was unsuccessfully denounced to the Emperor by the patriarch of Antioch in 448, but in the November of the same year Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum, impeached him before Flavian, the Bishop of Constantinople, and the permanent synod (Council of Bishops in constant residence at Constantinople). Eutyches was asked to appear in his own defence. The old monk, then in his seventieth year, came only after the third summons. The close questioning to which he was subjected may be reduced to two questions: 1) Is Christ consubstantial with us? Eutyches answered: *No*. 2) Are there two natures in Christ? The answer was: He had two before the Incarnation but only one afterwards[2]. He affirmed that such was the teaching of the Fathers and refused to retract it. He was excommunicated, deposed and interdicted. This was perhaps a severe sentence on an old man whose greatest fault was his ignorance and stubbornness, but it is explained by the synod's fear for the contamination of the faithful, a fear based on the condemned monk's attempts at propaganda. Eutyches, however, did not submit to his sentence. He wrote letters of appeal, especially to the Pope and Saint Peter Chrysologus [3]. Dioscurus of Alexandria immediately took him under his protection, and the Emperor, informed of the affair by Chrysaphius, convoked a fresh Council at Ephesus.

Much has been written on Eutyches' personal ideas, though in reality he appears to have evolved very little in definite form [4]. To him nevertheless have been attributed nearly all the forms of strict Monophysitism (hence the name of *Eutychianism*, usually given to the radical form of the heresy condemned at Chalcedon). Other authors, on the contrary, tend to absolve him from all error in the proper sense of the word, blaming especially his expressions and excusing him on the score of his ignorance. Nevertheless, this very real ignorance does not excuse him from denying, after having employed Saint Cyril's formula, "a nature",

[1] *Epist.*, XXVIII, c. 1. — [2] Mansi, *Concil.*, VI, 741.
[3] See below, p. 154.
[4] See M. Jugie, *Eutyches, I. c.*, col. 1559-1595.

that Christ is consubstantial with us. Such a denial implied that something is really taken away from Christ's human nature, and thus gave a hold to a veritable Monophysitism, which moreover put on the most varied forms.

II. CONDEMNATION OF MONOPHYSITISM.

At this time the Pope was *Saini Leo the Great*.· "A statesman with a well balanced mind", says Tixeront, "he was especially desirous of simple formulas and silence on insoluble questions" The case of Eutyches was bound to displease him from the very outset. He sought information from Flavian. Since the Council had been convoked by the Emperor he accepted it, but he was careful to define the Catholic faith in a very extensive *Dogmatic Instruction* addressed to Flavian[1], which he confided with other letters to the legates bound for Ephesus. This letter, which is known by the name of Tome to Flavian is "a dogmatic document of the greatest importances. The theological inspiration, however, is much feebler than in Saint Cyril's works, and speculation in the true meaning of the word finds no place therein Saint Leo has no desire either to discuss or· to demonstrate : *he pronounces and he judges.* Fie simply repeated the teaching of Tertullian and Saint Augustine, and that of the Orientals in so far as it was exact. He explains this teaching, however, with remarkable clearness and force, above all in a style of which the secret had been forgotten in the West[4]." A.11 his doctrine is summed up in the formula which finally prevailed : *one person* and *two natures;* Christ is one Person, possessing two natures.

Dioseurus, Patriarch of Alexandria since 444, presided the new Council of Ephesus (446) by order of the Court. He came ostensibly as a defender of the faith and Saint Cyril's formulas. At heart he was intent on humbling once again the See of Constantinople, which since 381 claimed to have precedence over his own. With the help of the Imperial troops and of fanatical monks armed with clubs, he

1 *Hist. Dogm.,* III. p. 86. — 3 4See below, p. 129.

3 " The letter to Flavian has become a dogmatic constitution clothed in all the majesty of the Papal magisterium. It is only necessary, however, to read it objectively in order to perceive that it does not possess the characteristics of an *ex cathedra* definition". P. BATIFFOL, 5. *Lion, Did. thiol.,* col. 251. This settles the question erstwhile " so interminably debated between theologians as to how an *ex cathedra* definition could be examined and confirmed by an (Ecumenical Council". */bid.,* col. 252.

4 T. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogni.,* nr, p. 86.

imposed his will on an assembly of 135 terrified bishops. Paying no heed whetever to the Pope's instructions, he rehabilitated Eutyches on the 8th August and deposed several bishops on the 22nd : Eusebius of Dorylaeum, Theodorct, Ibas, Domnus of Antioch, and especially Flavian, who died three days afterwards from the wounds he had received. The legates could do no more than flee', taking with them the letters of appeal from the victims of this assembly, which Saint Leo *(Ep.* 95) termed the Robber Council of Ephesus *(latrocinium Ephesinum),*[9] the name it still bears. The iniquitous decisions of this Council were maintained by Theodosius II [3] until his death (450).

The new Emperor, *Marciati* (450-457), was sincerely Catholic. All was changed. Anatolius, Flavian's successor, accepted without hesitation Saint Leo's dogmatic letter. Since the Emperor was desirous of convoking a new Council in the East, the Pope consented. The Council was held at Chalcedon (Oct. 451) and numbered 500 to 600 members. The Pope's legates had an effective presidency, since this had been formally exacted by the Pope[4]. In addition to questions of *faith,* the Council dealt with *personal matters* arising out of the Robber Comici1 and various *disciplinary* measures.

The faith was defined in the usual manner by the reading and solemn approval of the various documents in which it was set out : the Nicene Creed, the so-called Creed of Constantinople (381), Saint Cyril's fourth letter to Nestorius,

' The three legates (the Bishop Julius, the priest Renatus, the deacon Hilarus) should have protested and left at the first session, but as they did not know Greek they did not understand the gravity of the decisions that had been taken, although the refusal to let them read the letters from the Pope ought to have enlightened them as regards Dioscuros' plans. When, at the first sitting, Flavian, accused by Dioscurus, protested (παραιτοὐμαι σε, I challenge thee), the deacon Hilarus also cried out : *Contradicitur.* It was Hilarus who, escaping from Ephesus after the 22nd August, carried Flavian's letter of appeal to the Pope *(libellus appellationis,* found in 18S2 by Amelli, ó'. *Leone M. e l'Oriente).* Cf. Mommsen, *Nenes Arch.,* 1889 (xi), p. 362-364. Eusebius of Dorylaeum also appealed to the Pope in a letter (Cf. *ibid,,* 364-376) still more explicit as regards the faith of the Greek Catholic Church in the Apostolic See. Theodoret's letter to Leo (see above, p. 45) is also a veritable letter of appeal in spite of its general tone which has rendered him " suspect of being desirous of gaining Roman goodwill by language calculated to please at Rome ". For these three letters see P. BATIFFOL, *Le siège apostolique,* p. 513-519, and P. Bernardakis, *Les appels au Pape..,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1903 (Vi), p. 39-42.

3 See P. Martin, *I.es actes du brigandage d'Ephèse,* Paris, 1876.

3 Theodosius had not a vestige of willpower and his sister Pulcheria had no influence over him after him after the eunuch Chrysaphius came into power (441). It was the latter who, together with Dioscurus, was at the back of the whole intrigue. Immediately after the death of Theodosius, Pulcheria, seizing the power, condemned him to death. The Empress Eudoxia lived in retreat at Jerusalem. — 4 See below, p. 129.

the formula of union of the year 433 and Saint Leo's dogmatic letter. The legate presented the Pope as the *Archbishop of all the Churches*[1]. The Pope's letter, acclaimed by the whole assembly, having given rise to certain difficulties, was explained in private conferences to hesitant bishops who finally approved it unreservedly. This document, which possesses a full and definite authority, is not, nevertheless, the official formulary of the Council's profession of faith. Since the Emperor had probably asked for a text of which the written acceptation would allow him to recognise the Catholic Bishops, one was drawn up, which, without offering "the ample explanations of the Pope's letter, made short work of all ambiguity and satisfied the legates, who, moreover, assisted in drawing it up"[2]. The controverted dogma was expressed in these terms: "*One and the same Christ,* Son, Lord, only Son, *in two natures* (εν δύο φύσεσιν)[3] without confusion, without transformation, without division, without separation[4]." The text was accepted by acclamation and signed by the majority of bishops present (355 signatures).

The question of individuals was settled at the same time. *Dioscurus* was deposed on various motives of a disciplinary nature, especially on account of his conduct at Ephesus; but his companions at the "Robber Council" were spared. The victims were rehabilitated; *Theodoret* and *Ibas* consented to anathematise Nestorius. Ibas' letter to Maris was recognised as being orthodox by some *of* the Fathers, notably by the legates, but not by the Council as a whole. The condemnation of the year 553[5], did not contradict the Council's decision of 451[6].

Among the disciplinary decisions which were adopted in the final sessions of the Council should be mentioned the famous canon 28: to the primacy of honour recognised to the Bishop of Constantinople by the Council of 381 (can. 3) was added an *effective patriarchal authority*

1 Πασών των εκκλησιών αρχιεπίσκοπο. Mansi, vii, p. 9-10.

2 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogmf* in, p. 95-96.

3 The legates rejected a first formulary which contained an ambiguous expression *(ex duabus naturis, tr.* δύο φύσεων) and which was accepted by the Monophysites, who understood it in the sense of the two elements taken independently of the union.

4 Mansi, vii, 115 sq. Cf. Denzinger-Bann., *Enchiridion symbolorum,* n. 148.

5 See below, p. 86.

6 Further, the difference in viewpoint would explain the different attitudes taken by the two Councils. In 451 it was chiefly a question of Ibas' *person,* and all that was looked for in his letter was an explicit heretical affirmation which might have prevented his rehabilitation. In 553 the *teller itself* was examined and in it were found not only formal errors but also only too real and dangerous tendencies, as was proveed in actual fact.

over Asia Minor and Thracia Saint Leo refused to recognise this usurpation, which was not admitted at Rome until the thirteenth century. The patriarchs of Antioch and of Alexandria found yet another motive in canon 28 for the rejection of the Council of Chalcedon.

This great assembly did not succeed in bringing about the religious pacification of the East. Its doctrinal decisions were blamed. They were nevertheless necessary and opportune. Nestorianism had been justly condemned at Ephesus, but now the rigid interpretation which Saint Cyril's friends were giving to his expressions were tending to destroy, not Christ's personal unity, but His human integrity. Saint Leo's formula was no compromise, but it now held the middle place between the two tendencies, and it attracted from the two opposite camps those moderate men who had a sincere love of truth. For centuries it was the basis of Oriental *orthodoxy* and in the long run it exercised a most useful influence. But heads were too hot at the time to permit of a general pacification; local quarrels complicated by political aspirations embittered a conflict which should never have passed out of the spiritual sphere.

The Nestorians regarded the Council of Chalcedon chiefly as a rehabilitation of Nestorius' followers, and perhaps ofNestorius himself, and were thus encouraged to persevere in their teaching. On the other hand, the strict followers of Saint Cyril, deceived either by the triumphant cries of those who had been condemned in 431, or by an incomplete understanding of the Alexandrian expressions, thought the decisions taken at Chalcedon signified the abandonment of the doctrine of Ephesus. Consequently they all came forward with many and various theories, all thoroughly convinced defenders of *Monophysitism.*

The latter must now be dealt with, before we explain the work of the Catholic theologians who set themselves the task of clearing up misunderstandings, and showing the real agreement between Ephesus and Chalcedon.

III.—VARIOUS KINDS OE MONOPHYSITISM.

All the Monophysites were agreed in opposing Nestorianism and the Catholic doctrine as formulated at Chalcedon; but when they endeavoured to express their own teaching

* See Vol. I, p. 305.

they were in the greatest disagreement. As a result of this, their system presents itself in the most varied *forms,* although the protagonists of each form did not necessarily constitute a separate sect. They may be classed under two heads: *strict* Monophysitism and *mitigated* Monophysitism.

A) Strict Monophysitism [1].

Strict Monophysitism is that which, taking the word φύσι *(nature)* literally, teaches that in Christ there is really a *unity of nature,* in the true sense of the word. This doctrine, on the contrary, is considerably modified in *mitigated* Monophysitism, both as regards the idea and the terminology, while it was political in its ends rather than theological. The radical form of Monophysitism is also called *Eutychianism,* although it is difficult to know what Eutyches really thought[2]. This error is found in four chief forms and several secondary derived forms[3].

I. Chief forms. There are four of these, one connected with the human nature, another with the divine nature, and the remaining two with the union of these two elements.

«) Certain Monophysites taught the *absorption of the human nature* by tbe divine, which alone subsists, as a drop of honey is absorbed by the sea in which it is dissolved [4]. These heretics were logically led to attribute suffering to the divine nature, i. e., to be rigid Theopaschites, for this word is often used, in a broad sense, to signify all Monophysites, on account of the expression *qui crucifixus est fro nobis*[5] which they added to the Trisagion.

Z») Others taught the *disappearance of the Word*[6] in the humanity according to Saint Paul's phrase : *Exinanivit semetipsum,* translating ἐκενωσεν εαυτόν from the original : hence the doctrine termed Kenosis [7]. These theories have been attributed to Eutyches and to the Apollinarists[8].

1 Also called *real* Monophysitism as distinct from *verbal* Monophysitism; but these expressions should not be taken to mean that only the followers of the former were in error whilst the latter were orthodox in every way.

2 See above, p. 53.

3 They will be mentioned in logical rather than in historical order, since their origin is not sufficiently determined. See M. JUGIE, *Eutychès, of. eit.,* col. 1601 sq.

4 According to Theodoret, *Eranistes, ⁄. G.,* 83, 153.

5 This formula is of course admitted by Catholics in a very orthodox sense, sometimes with certain modifications.

6 Other' say " condensation of the Word into flesh " : an equally extravagant expression.

7 A teaching falsely attributed to Saint Hilary. Cf. Vol. I, p. 363.

8 According to Marius Mercator.

¿) The classical form of Monophysitism is that which admits in Christ a mixture *of the divine and human natures,* which results in a divino-human or theandric nature : in Christ there exists only one essence, only one property. The best known of the representatives of this system is Sergius the Grammarian, combated by Severus of Antioch in the sixth century.

d} The most subtle form of strict Monophysitism is that which taught the composition in a natural whole, *without confusion,* of the humanity and the divinity, just as two incomplete substances, the body and the soul, unite to form man, a new and complete substance : in the Incarnation, however, the theandric composition supposes that the two elements are, and remain, complete. This doctrine, which was derived from Apollinarianism*, was for a long time attributed, not without apparent grounds, to the principal representatives of the mitigated Monophysites, notably the Severians;2 this attribution was nevertheless false, as will be seen later.

2. Derived Forms 3.

The following are the better known sects :

λ) The Actistetae taught that the body of Christ, like His divinity, was "uncreated".

V) ThePhantasiasts supposed that He had but an "apparent" body; this is pure Docetism.

c) Aphthardocetae had it that this body was "incorruptible" and impassible, both in practice and in theory. See Julian of Halicarnassus4.

f The Niobites (followers of Stephen Niobes) held that it was impossible to distinguish the divine from the human nature in Christ.

d The Agnoetae 5 rightly maintained the natural infirmities of Christ's human nature, but they exaggerated in many ways by denying Him any knowledge surpassing common human knowledge.

/) As for the Acephali6, they were exalted Monophysites who refused to accept the Henoticon and thus separated themselves from communion with all the patriarchs ; it was only in this sense that they were "without ahead", for they had their own bishops.

B) Mitigated Monophysitism.

This less narrow form of Monophysitism was professed by the most influential and most intelligent adversaries of Chalcedon. The majority of the patriarchs and theologians of this party taught a less rigid doctrine than the sects mentioned above. In many cases it would seem to have

' Apollinarianism, in the true sense of the word, mutilated Christ's humanity. Cf. Vol. I, p. 451.

' See M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 1601, 1607.

3 See J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 112-129.

4 See below, p. 66.

5 See A. Vacant, *Agnoites,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 586-596. See chiefly J. LebrETON, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité* Paris, 1910, p. 458-463.

6 See S. VailhÉ, *Acéphales,* in *Diet. Hist.,* col, 282-288.

been Monophysitism only in name. They claimed that they abided by Saint Cyril's expressions and teaching. They were not the less dangerous for that. In reality, they fell into heresy, not only on account of their revolt against the solemn magisterium of the Church, but also through their stubbornness in combating the Catholic formulas defined at Chalcedon. Had their teaching been truly free of all reproach they could have accepted the latter, just as Saint Cyril accepted the Antiochian expressions in 433, while continuing to employ his own terminology, Further, many of them were the accomplices and patrons of rigid Monophysites; Dioscurus, for instance, with regard to Eutyches; all had a tendency to diminish Christ's human nature r, and by their foolish obstinacy in defending as solely orthodox, expressions of which the danger was only too obvious (the abuse of these by the most zealous of their followers is sufficient proof of this), they became the true propagators of the heresy, and openly showed that their own interpretations were more dear to them than orthodoxy.

IV. MONOPHYSITISM AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

The doctrine defined at Chalcedon was supported by the Emperor *Marciali* (450-457); this same policy was pursued by *Leo I* (457-474), and also, at least for a long time, by the Emperor Zeno (474-491). The usurper, Basiliscus (476-477), in opposition to the policy of the Emperor whom he had dethroned, set himself up as a protector of the Monophysites: his Encyclical in the year 476 [3] was a veritable dogmatic decree condemning the Council of Chalcedon; he was obliged to withdraws it later on account of the opposition of the Catholic population which was stirred up by the monks. Zeno's return to power restored official support to the faith of Chalcedon, until the time that this Emperor judged it better suited to his interests to adopt another policy.

[1] At least tacitly in cases when silence was no longer permissible; in the question, for instance, of natures envisaged as such. They came, moreover, to consider that there was but one "energy" in Christ; a view which was destined to give rise to Monothelism. See p. 297.

[2] Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.,* 111, 4·, *P. G.,* 86 (2), 2600 sq.

[3] By the *Contra Encyclical* (477) which condemned both Nestorius and Eutyches.

In 482 Zeno published a so-called *edict of union* (Ενοχικόν Henoticon)x, with a view to reconciling the adversaries of Chalcedon, on the basis of the Counter Encyclical. " Here both Nestorius and Eutyches are anathematised; the humanity and divinity of Christ are affirmed, but the word *one* and the term *two natures* are passed over in silence; in addition, and most unfortunately, the Henoticon condemns " whoever has thought otherwise, either at *Chalcedon* or elsewhere". This document thus indirectly condemned the Council of Chalcedon. Further it was declared that the rule of faith comprised only the Nicene Creed, together with the additions made at Constantinople, Saint Cyril's twelve anathematisms and the decisions of Ephesus "13 As may be seen, the Henoticon contained nothing that was expressly heterodox 3, but it meant the abandonment of the Council of Chalcedon. Such a position, aggravated as it was by a biased allusion, was likely to prove extremely dangerous, given the general state of mind prevalent at the time.

The real author of this document was Acacias *, Patriarch of Constantinople from 471 to 489, who moreover was here acting in complete agreement with Peter Mongus of Alexandria, a resolute adversary of the Council of Chalcedon. In the time of Basiliscus, Aeacius had, after certain hesitations, energetically taken up the defence of the faith of Chalcedon. This attitude had been almost forced upon him by the courageous stand made by the Catholic population of Constantinople, and also perhaps by his desire not to abandon a Council which had conferred patriarchal rights upon his See 5. In a letter written about this same time to the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Peter Fullo6,7 he declared himself as being absolutely opposed to the latter and his liturgical innovations. After Zeno had returned to power, he also persuaded Rome to condemn this same Peter Fullo and Peter Mongus *of* Alexandria (478) ~. Nevertheless, after having obtained the Emperor's confirmation of the 28th canon of Chalcedon, he himself gradually began to turn towards these same Monophysites in an

1 Evagrius, *Hist. Eccl.*, in, 14.

9S. Salaville, *H¿notique,* in *Diet. théol.,* col. 2153.

3 This is the opinion generally admitted by recent historians, since Noël Alexandre *(Hist. Eccl.,* saec. V, c. ill, a. 19) against Baronius *(Ann. Eccl.,* a. 482). — 4 See M. Jugie, *Acace,* in *Diet. Hist.,* col. 244-248.

5 The Patriarch of Alexandria, supported by Basiliscus, tried to annul the 28th canon of Chalcedon by restoring to the Church of Ephesus, in a Council held at Ephesus itself in 477, her rights of exarchate, which were suppressed in 451 in favour of Constantinople.

6 Mansi, *Ampi. coll,* cone., vu, 1121-1124.

7 There is still extant a letter written by Acacius to Pope Simplicius *(P. L.,* 58, 46-47) in which he shows himself somewhat impatient of the exhortations addressed to him by Rome.

endeavour to subject to himself Antioch and Alexandria, the two great sees of the East On the other hand, he desired to throw off the authority of Rome, which continued to refuse its approval of canon 28, and whose effective surveillance seemed unbearable to the new Patriarch, so proud of the titles of his Church although they were so new and so little established. When, in the year 482, Peter Mongus was again placed at the head of the See of Alexandria by the Monophysite party and proposed to Constantinople a fairly wide basis of agreement between the Catholic and the Monophysite parties, Acacius showed himself disposed to welcome it. He therefore suggested to the Emperor the edict known as *Henoticon,* which was immediately signed by himself and Peter Mongus*. The Bishops who refused to accept it were driven from their Sees.

The Pope, Saint Simplicius (468-492) protested, and his successor, Felix III, took active measures. Although the legates whom he sent to Constantinople allowed themselves to be intimidated by violence and corrupted by bribes, he was not deceived; he pronounced sentence of excommunication and deposition against Acacius on account of his anti-canonical usurpation of the rights of other sees and the favour he had shown to heretics. Opposition to Acacius was energetically fomented at Constantinople by the monks, notably the Acoemetae;[3] Acacius replied by coming into the open. He erased the name of the Pope from the Diptychs and thus plunged the whole of the East into schism, the *Schism of Acacius,* which was to last for 35 years. This crisis permitted the Monophysite heresy to develop freely. It was, however, primarily and before all, a schism, the first fruits of the elevation of the See of Constantinople to the dignity of a patriarchate. Thus, at Constantinople, only thirty years after the creation of this dignity, there arose a tendency to separation from Rome and even a desire of taking the place of the See of Peter. But this attempt at separation, which was to be successful in the XIth century, was premature in the Vth. Union was restored through public opinion and the strength of tradition[3], and endured for a long period in spite of various crises[4].

It was in 518 that the Emperor Justin (518-527), a sincere orthodox, entered into negotiations with the pope, Saint Hormisdas (514-523) with a view to restoring peace to the Church. The Monophysite bishops were forced to quit their

[1] The third extant letter of Acacius, addressed to Peter Mongus (in Zacharias Rhetor, ed. Ahrens-Krueger, p. 82-84) compliments Mongus on his subscription to the Hcnoticon. These three letters are all that remain of Acacius'voluminous correspondence. The Acacius-Mongus correspondence published after a Coptic manuscript by Revillout *(fico. Quest. Hist.,* p. 103-119), is spurious.

[3] It was one of the latter who notified Acacius of his excommunication by attaching the papal sentence to his pallium. He suffered death in consequence. On the Acoemetae see below, p. 73.

[4] See Theophanes, year 510. During the schism several patriarchs tried in vain to obtain a reconciliation with Rome. See S. Salaville, *op. cit.,* col. 2170 sq.

[4] The separations which came after the schism of Acacius were due to heresy in the strict sense of the word, rather than to the spirit of schism.

sees and were replaced by orthodox bishops, especially at Antioch. John II, the Patriarch of Constantinople, was in favour of the union. Taking their example from him, the whole orthodox Oriental episcopacy agreed to sign the famous formula of Hormisdas[1] in which the *privileges of the Roman See*[2] were so clearly affirmed. First, the *origins* of these privileges is shown; the words of Christ and the enduring orthodoxy of Rome; "Et quia non potest D. N. Jesu Christi praetermitti sententia dicentis: tu es Petrus, etc. Haec quia dicta sunt, rerum probantur affectus, quia in Sede Apostolica citra maculam semper est catholica servata religio". Then follow two *particular obligations:* 1) that of following the prescriptions of Rome in all things: "Sequentes in omnibus Apostolicam sedem et praedicantes ejus omnia constituta 2) that of remaining united to Rome in order to remain in the Catholic communion, for the names of those who were termed "sequestratos a communione Ecclesiæ catholicæ, id est non consentientes sedi apostolicæ". were to be erased from the diptychs. By this was meant Nestorius, Eutyches, Timothy Ælurus, Dioscurus, Peter Mongus, Acacius, and Peter Fullo, specifically named by the pope. It is this formula, as Father Salaville so acutely remarks, which constituted the "truly orthodox *Henoticoni*". The very fact that union was restored at Constantinople ensured that heresy was staved off for many years to come.

V. MONOPHYSITISM AT ALEXANDRIA.

Monophysitism, claiming to be the rightful expression of Saint Cyril's teaching, took root in Egypt more vigorously than elsewhere, and ended by completely separating this Christian community from the Catholic Church. The following are the chief representatives of this heresy, although little of their writings remain:

I. **Dioscurus**[4]. Cyril's successor in 444, famous for the part he took in the *Robber Council of Ephesus* 449, deposed at Chalcedon in 451

[1] Text in DENZIGER-Bann., *Enchiridion,* n. 171-172.

[2] The patriarch affirmed, in a very respectful prologue, that the Churches of the new and the old Rome formed but one Church. Mansi, *Cone.,* vili, 451. The document as a whole, and the history of the Vth century, show in what sense this ambiguous document is to be understood.

[3] *Op. cit.,* col. 2175.

[4] J. Lebon, *op. cit.,* p. S4-93. For complete biography see G. Bareille, *Dioscure,* in *Diet théol.,* col. 1369-1375.

died at Gangres in 454, has left only fragments of correspondence, and perhaps, in a revised form, six canons or anathemas against the Council of Chalcedon. These latter were later to be used by the Monophysites in their resistance to Catholicism. Although he did not adopt all Eutyches's ideas, he defended him, and is responsible for the progress made by the heresy.

2. Timothy Ælurus [1] (Αἴλουρο , the Cat), ordained priest by Saint Cyril, accompanied Dioscurus at the Robber Council and was named Patriarch of Alexandria by the Monophysites in 457 on the assassination of Proterius, the Catholic Bishop. He was driven from Alexandria by the Emperor Leo, exiled at Gangres, where Dioscurus had died, and finally sent to Chersonese. He was recalled by Basiliscus in 476, re-established the exarchate of Ephesus (477) and soon afterwards returned to Alexandria, where he died in the same year. He left a number of documents which furnish an insight into his teaching : I. *A Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo* (previous to his exile) ; 2. *Against those who say : two natures* (written during exile); this latter is a vast collection of Patristic texts[2] purporting to be against the Catholic teaching and arranged systematically for the purpose of combating it; 3. a *Book of Narratives,* a kind of ecclesiastical history, anti-Nestorian in tendency; 4. lastly, a number of *letters,* among which, one is addressed to the Church of Constantinople, another to that of Alexandria and a third to the whole of Egypt. His Christological teaching consisted in that mitigated Monophysitism we have already mentioned[3]. Without discussing the question of his sincerity[4], it must be admitted that he had a baneful influence as regards the development of the heresy, although in theory he apparently disassociated himself from the rigid Eutychians.

3. Peter Mongas (Μογγο , the "hoarse") is chiefly famous for the indirect but effective part he took in the composition of the Henoticon[5]. He was named Patriarch by the Monophysites, in 447, but was deposed by Zeno. In order to regain his See he inspired the new religious policy which Zeno adopted after 482 on the advice of Acacius. He died in 489. Only three of his letters are extant, one of which is to Acacius[6]. His teaching was much the same as that of Timothy Ælurus.

4. Julian of Halicarnassus[7], the Monophysitc Bishop of that town in Asia Minor at the beginning of the sixth century, was obliged to leave his see in 518, and spent the end of his life in Egypt (he probably died shortly after 527) where he propagated his strange doctrine on the

1 See J. Lebon, *La Christologie de Tim. Ælure,* in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1908, p. 667-702.

2 See P. Cavallera, *Le dossier patristique de Tim. Ælure,* in *Bull. Litt. Eccl.,* 1909, p. 342-359. — 3 See p. 59-60.

4 P. Nau, *Sur la Christologie de Timothée Ælure,* in *Rev. de l'Or. chrét.,* 1909, p. 99-103.

5 See above, p. 61.

6 The Mongus-Acacius correspondence is spurious. See above, p. 61.

7 See R. Draguet, *Julien d'H. et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'Incorruptibilité du corps du Christ,* Louvain, 1924; *Julien d'H.,* in *Diet, théol.* col. 1931-1940. M. Jugie. *Julien a Halicarnasse et Sévère d'Antioche,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1925 (L 24). p. 129-162 and 257-285.

incorruptibility of the Body of Christ : *Apkthartodocetisni,* a partial docetism or docetism of incorruption (from ἀφθαρτο incorrupt). His teaching is usually explained in the following form : from the moment of His Incarnation, Christ had an impassible and incorruptible body, and this privilege remained even in the midst of the sufferings He consented to undergo and which, in reality, He suffered only by virtue oían act of His will, and as if by a miracle. This theory, which Julian himself admitted to be extremely mysterious, is derived from the Monophysite tendency to tighten the bonds which connect the human and divine natures in Christ, and to exaggerate the principle, in itself excellent, that the human nature of a God should possess all possible perfections. Severus of Antioch rightly maintained against Julian that Christ was impassible only after His Resurrection[1]. According to M. Dragnet's more *subtle explanation,* Aphthartodocetism affirmed only that the very real infirmities of Christ's human nature do not allow it to be called φθαρτή since they are not, as in other men, a consequence of original sin (φθορά);' His incorruption (αφθαρσία) signifies only the total exemption from original sin and its consequences[A] Severus then, according to M. Dragnet, attacked this fundamentally orthodox teaching simply because he lacked an exact idea of original sin; in reality it was rather he who erred[25] The *Julianists,* or *Aphthartodocetae* or *Galaniles* [s], formed a powerful sect for a long period, but were recognised neither by the Catholics nor the official leaders of Monophysitism.

5. Sergius the Grammarian was, at the beginning of the sixth century, the chief exponent of strict Monophysitism at Alexandria. He affirmed that Christ, the Man-God, is a single substance (μια ουσία) and was also attacked by Severus[6], who did not realise that he was himself in great measure responsible for these errors by his obstinate refusal to admit the formulas of Chalcedon and Saint Cyril. Two other Alexandrian Monophysites, the grammarian, John Philoponus[7][8] about the middle of the sixth century, and the theologian, Stephen Gobarus, towards the end of the century, complicated their Christological error with another on the Trinity : just as in Christ there is unity of nature because of the unity of hypostasis, so in God there must be three natures since there are three hypostases. They were called *Tritheists*,* although

[1] Fr. Jugie maintains this conception of Julian's error, contrary to R. Dragnet. *Echos d'Orient, toe. cit.*

[2] For the meaning of this word, see Vol. I, p. 442.

[3] " It is very probable that Julian did not sufficiently distinguish concupiscence from original sin; but he admitted that suffering, the unavoidable lot of mankind, isa punishment of the sin transmitted by our parents". R. Draguet, *Diet, ihlol.,* col. 1936.

[4] In order to defend his opinions, Julian wrote various treatises *(Tome, Additions. Adversus blasphemias Severi, Discourse against the Manichaeans and theEutychians)* which, save for fragments, are notextant. See R. Draguet, *0/. cit.* A number of his letters and a commentary on Job (in Latin) are extant.

[5] See M. Jugie, *Gaianite (controverse),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1002-1022. Gaianos was one of the leaders of the sect.

[6] See J. Lebon, *op. cit.,* p. 163-172. and 538-581 (abstract of the Severus-Sergius correspondence).

[7] G. Bardy, *Jean Philipon* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 831-839.

[8] See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogrn.,* in, p. 196.

they denied leaching three Gods. A little later Damian, an Alexandrian Monophysite (578-605), fell into another Trinitarian error, which caused both him and his followers, the *Damianitcs,* to be accused of Modalisni and sometimes of Tetradism (the doctrine of *quaternity)* '. They are best known under the name of *Fetraditcs*

After the sixth century, the majority of Egyptian native Christians or *Copts* lapsed into Monophysitism ; since that time all Coptic theological literature is also Monophysite.

VI. MONOPHYSITISM IN SYRIA.

The chief protagonists of Syrian Monophysitism are two patriarchs of Antioch who wrote in Greek (Peter Fullo and Severus), together with several bishops and monks who wrote in Syriac, and who, through hatred of their Nestorian rivals, also broke away from the orthodox teaching as defined at Chalcedon, and succeeded in weaning their entire national literature from Catholic influence.

A) Authors who wrote in Greek.

1. **Peter Fullo** (488)3 was a clever monk who succeeded in having himself named Monophysite Bishop of Antioch about 470, again under Basiliscus about 476 and finally under Zeno, 485-488. He is especially famous for a liturgical innovation : he added to the Mass hymn known as the Trisagion *(Sanctus Deus, sanctus fortis, sanctus immortalis, miserere nobis)* the words *qui crucifixus es pro nobis.* It is possible that Peter used these words of Christ inasmuch as He is called three times holy4. Usually, however, particularly at Constantinople, the Trisagion was applied to the Trinity and thus Fullo's addition was calculated to lead to Patripassianism and Eutychianism. On account of this at least ambiguous expression, all the Monophysites, rigid or not, have come to be called *Theopaschites*5.

2. **Severus of Antioch** 6, Patriarch of that town, from 512 to 518, who died in 538, was a remarkable theologian

' Tixeront, *Hist. Do°m.,* in, p. 196-197.

* We have already mentioned above (p. 59) the error of the Agnoetae on the knowledge of Christ, chiefly propagated by the Deacon of Alexandria, Themistius, about 540; and the sect of the Acephali, comprising the intransigent Monophysites, who after the end of the fifth century in the lime of Peter Mongus, revolted against the liberalism of the patriarchs.

3 Cf. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* p. 105-106. S. Vailhé, *Antioche,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 1405-1406.

4 The *Scythian monks* propagated this expression in a Catholic sense. See below, p. 73.

3 For the Monophysite use of the formula *One ofthe Tiiii¡ly has been crucified,* see J Lehon, *op. at.,* p. 479-486.

I M. PEISKER, *Severus V0n Antiochen,* Halle, 1902. J. LEBON, *Le monophysume stvtnen,* Louvain, 1909. J- Tixeront, *Hist. Do&n* t in n 117.127 W. E. Crum, *Sivere d'Antioche en Egypte,* in *Rev. Or. ehr¿7,* 1923, p. 92-10^

of mitigated Monophysitism. He was as notable for the fertility of his writings and the subtility of his mind as he was for his unyielding bigotry and his stubbornness in the service of a false cause. He was a native of Pisidia and had studied letters and law before he was converted about 488. He became a monk in Palestine and was rapidly won over to Monophysitism, which he first defended against the monk Xephalius in Syria, and later at Constantinople during a mission he carried out in that town from 508 to 511 L His great work, *Philalethes,* written between 508 and 511 against the Chalcedonians, dates from this period 23 Later, at the beginning of his Patriarchate he published an *Apology for Philalethes.* But his really great controversies were those in which he engaged with the Eutychianist, Sergius the Grammarian 3, during his stay at Antioch (515), and with the orthodox Catholic, John the Grammarian, during his exile in Egypt 45 (519), and shortly afterwards with Julian of Halicarnassus 5. In 553 he was invited to take part in the religious conferences at Constantinople, in which he succeeded in winning over the Patriarch, Anthimus, to his ideas. He died in 538, leaving behind him a vast number of theological works, which, in a great measure, are as yet unedited.

Important fragments of his work6 are preserved in early Greek writings; the greater part, however, is preserved only in Syriac translations.

His *correspondence* comprises no less than 3759 letters : some of these have been edited 7. Lebon has analysed a number of theological letters.

Of the 125 *homilies* composed during his patriarchate, only homily 77, with various fragments, is extant in Greek; but nearly all the remainder remain in a Syriac translation. Homilies 52-77 have recently been edited8.

Early lives of Severus by Zacharias Rhetor, *P. O., 2* (see below, p. 112), John of Beith-Aphthonia, *ibid.,* Athanasius, *O.,* 4 (ed. E. J. Goodspeed). See Mgr Duchesne, *L'Eglise au VIe siècle,* Paris, 1925.

1 J. Lebon, *op. cit.,* p. 43 sq. — 2 *Ibid.,* p. 124.

3 *Ibid.,* p. 163-172. See above, p. 65.

4 Book in of the *Contra Grammaticum (Joannem)* is summarised by J. Lebon, *ibid.,* p. 147-163.

5 See above, p. 64. Against Julian he wrote *letters, a Criticism,* a *Refutation ofJulians propositions,* etc. See R. Draguet, *Julien d'Halicamasse,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1934.

6 Eustathius (see below, p. 72); the *Doctrina Patrum de incarnatione Verbi* (ed. Diekamp, 1907). See *P. G.,* 86, I and 2.

7 L. W. Brooks, *The Sixth Rook of Select Letters O/Severus, 2* Vol., London, 1902, 1904; and *P. O.,* 12, 14 : 118 letters. Lebon, *op. cit.,* p. 538-551.

8 *P. O.,* 4 (ed. R. Duval), 8, 12 (ed. M. Brière), 16 (ed. M. A. Kugener, E. Triffaux).

CHAPTER V.

Severus' contribution to liturgy was an *Anaphora* for a Mass of the Pre-sanctified and a somewhat large number of hymns a.

It is through Severus we possess the first information regarding the alleged writings of *Dionysius the Areopagite* (553) which he already seems to have quoted at the Council of Tyre 1[illegible] in 513. But, apart from other reasons, the Neo-Platonist nature of these writings is too little consonant with what is known of Severus to allow of any serious consideration of the hypothesis that claims they were composed by him4.*

Severus' Christologrcal teaching' appears at first glance to be a systematic presentation of Saint Cyril's. Like the doctrine of Chalcedon it occupies a middle place between Nestorianism and Eutychianism; itdiverges fromChalcedonian orthodoxy, however, both in its expressions and in its tendencies.

Like the Alexandrians Severus reduces the three words οὐσ'. , ὑπόστασι , πρόσωπον, to the sense of personó. Christ *has* not a single nature, He *is* a single *nature* or *person,* that is, the Word. In this is summed up the whole of his teaching on the Incarnation : the nature or the person of the Word became Incarnate6;* not that it might become another, but in order to exist in *another way.*

Christ's humanity, which He took from Mary, is truly complete, and is united to the Word by a *physical union*l which excludes both the Nestorian dualism and the Eutychian confusion. This union, which like that of body and soul, respects the integrity of the two elements, is a composition (σύνΘεσι) : it is the person of the Word (φύσι) which becomes ¢i composed" (σύνθετο;) by the addition of the human nature8; thus Christ, while remaining God and consubstantial with the Father, is also consubstantial with man.

Nevertheless, Severus refuses to admit two natures in Christ, save by means of a mental distinction9 which discovers that in Christ the divine and human essence (οὐσία) are not confused. Christ of course is *from* two natures (εκ δύο φύσεων)10 but since He is one (εἳ;) He is one

1 See Rucker, *Die syrische [acobosanaphora,* Munster, 1923.

' L. W. Brooks, in *P. O.,* 6, 7.

3 Diekamp and Lebon give the date as 514-515·

4 The attribution of the Areopagitica to Severus is due to Father Stiglmayr himself, *Scholastik,* 1928 .111), 1-27. 161-1S9, In spite of his authority in these matters, his opinion has Ixren actively and decisively opposed by such serious authors as J. Lebon. See chiefly *Pev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1930, 880-915.

s J. Lebon, *op. cit.*

6 This is the Cyrillian expression. See above, p. 35. J, Lebon, *op. cit.,* 300333·

i 'Ενωσι; φυσική ζατα ζυσ-.ν, καθ' υπόστασιν. Cf. J. Lebon, *op. cit.,* p. 2S3-292. —9 *ibid.,* p. 292-297 and p. 200-204.

9 Δυο φύσει; ἐν θεωρίφ. J. Lebon, *op. it.,* p. 343-369.

,u *Ibid.,* p. 370-412.

nature. But what Severus refuses to concede under the name of nature he concedes in a great measure under the term *of property :* first of all he distinguishes the essentiahproperty or specific essence (ποιότη φυσική) from the human being and the divine being, and this essence is incommunicable; he then distinguishes the attributes (ιδιώματα) or simple properties (ποίοτη) which are particular to each being, but which are not separable, and which we are obliged, by virtue of the communication of characters, to unite in the same subject[1]. To the property is linked up the *operation* or energy; Christ's actions are of two categories, but since Christ is one, His operation is one. The same is to be said of the will ; the acts are diverse, but since there is but one subject that wills, there is but one will[2].

In using these expressions Severus does not make formal profession of Monothelitism ; he merely wishes to point out that actions, even those proper to the human nature, must be attributed to the one person of the Incarnate Word. His whole doctrine seems to be different from Catholic teaching only through a rigid use of the communication of characters[3] since he goes as far as to declare it wrong to give the name of nature to the humanity assumed by the Word.

In this there is not, properly speaking, a Christological error, but there is a dangerous tendency to diminish the human nature of Christ. With the purpose, or the pretext, of avoiding the Nestorian separation of the man and the God, he refused to regard Christ's humanity as a *separate nature.* This of course was a result of the identification, which he took as a first principle, of the terms *nature, hypostasis, person;* it was also the consequence of faulty philosophical reasoning.

In spite of his having recognised individual properties, Severus seems to deprive the human nature of its *individual character* by refusing to consider it separately, since to his mind there is no distinction between the individual and the person. It was with good reason therefore that Leontius Byzantinus developed his theory of the ἐνυπόστατον, that is to say, the individual concrete nature as distinct from the hypostasis[4]. The Severians were too stubbornly rooted in the narrowness of their views to be able to grasp this distinction. The tendency which had led them into schism in the face of the teaching of the most imposing of the early Councils, also prevented them from yielding to the arguments of a simple theologian, and Monothelism, which was destined to perturb the whole of the seventh century, was no more than a remote but direct effect of their Christology. Whatever may have been his learning and subtility, Severus, in spite of his apparent orthodoxy and perhaps his real good faith, was none the less a redoubtable author of schism and heresy in the Eastern Church.

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 413-442. — [2] *Ibid.,* p. 443-466.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 467-486. — [4] See below', p. 75-78.

B) Authors who wrote in Syriac x.

A great number of Monophysite authors wrote in Syriac. Only the more outstanding will be mentioned here.

1. **Philoxenus of Mabbogh** Bishop of that town from 485 to 518, who died in exile in 523, was a friend of Severus of Antioch, whose ideas he shared. He left a number of theological, scriptural and liturgical writings, several of which have been edited. The version of the Bible bearing his name *(Philoxenian version)* is not due to him but to his auxiliary Bishop, Polycarp[3].

2. **James of Sarugh** [4] (d. 521), Bishop of Sarugh on the Euphrates, is one of the best Syriac writers. He left innumerable writings, chiefly in verse. As regards the latter, there may be mentioned more than 700 metrical homilies, some of which have recently been edited.

3. **Stephen Bar-Sudaili**[5] was a Monophysite monk of pantheistic tendencies, whose errors were attacked by Philoxenus and James of Sarugh. The work known as the *Book of Hierotheus,* which Dionysius the Areopagite claimed to have written, is also attributed to him[6].

4. **John Bar-Cursus**[7] (d. 538), Bishop of Telia, left various writings, but he is chiefly known as the precursor of Jacob of Telia in the organisation of Syrian Monophysitism.

The work of these writers and theologians would not have succeeded in saving Monophysitism from the fate which Justinian's rigorous measures rendered inevitable in the middle of the sixth century had not Jacob of Telia, nicknamed Baradaf (the Ragged) [8], Bishop of Edessa from 543 to 578, with the complicity of the Empress Theodora, secretly established a dissident hierarchy in Syria and the neighbouring countries. The Syrian Monophysite Church was thus fully justified in calling itself the Jacobite Church.

The following are among the better known Monophysite Syrian writers of the period which followed Jacob Baradaf.

i. **John of Asia or John of Ephesus**[9] (d. after 585) is known for his *Lives oj the Oriental Saints* (about 568) and especially his *Ecclesiastical History* (the 3rd Book only is extant), which is important in any

x General bibliography : R. Duval, *La Utt. Syriaque,* Paris, 1899, (3rd ed., X907). A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur,* Bonn, 1922.

3 Duval, 221 sq., 354-356. Baumstark, 141-144. A. Vaschalde, *Thru Letters of Philoxenus,* Rome 1902; *Tract, de Trin. et Incani.,* Paris-Rome, 1907. J. Lebon, *op. cil.,* p. 111-118; *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1911, p. 413-436.

3 A. Baumstark, *op. cit.,* p. 144-145.

4 Duval, *op. cit..* 351-354· Baumstark, *op. cit.,* p. 148-158. E. Tisserant, *Jacques de* in *Did. théol.,* col. 300-305.

s R. Duval, *op. cit.,* p. 356-358. Baumstark, *op. cit.,* p 167

1 ?eebltfl°^' P· 87· — ; Duval, *op. cit.,* p. 359. Baumstark, *òp. cit.,* p. 174.

• See L. Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 106-108.

9 E. Tisserant, in *Did. thiol.,* vni, p. 752-753- Cf. F. Nau, in *Rev. Or. chrét.,* U, p. 455 493·

study of Monophysitism, and more reliable than the Apocalypses of John Rufus'.

2. Paul of Telia[3] translated Origen's Hexapla about 616-617.

3. Thomas of Heraclea[3] at the same date revised the Philoxenian version.

4. James of Edessa[4] (640-708) was an encyclopaedist, author of many studies on theology and Holy Scripture.

5. Jacob Bar-Salibi[5] (d. 1171), Bishop of Amid, was a very fertile writer who composed works of exegesis, theology, liturgy, etc.

6. Gregory Bar-Hæbræus[6] (d. 1286), son of a convert Jew (hence his name), was a bishop and man of letters who left such an immense and varied work that it is not possible here to attempt any enumeration.

We have mentioned these writers for the purpose of showing that Syrian Christianity, even after the separation, maintained a certain level of intellectual culture.

CHAPTER VI.

The Adversaries of Monophysitism.

Leontius Byzantinus.

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY (on Leontius Byzantinus)[7].

Editions : *P. G.*, 86, Mai, *Spicilegium Roman., X.*

Studies : V. Ermoni, *De Leontio Byzantino,* Paris, 1895. P. Loofs, *Leontius von Byzanz,* Leipzig, 1887 *(Text u. Unters.).* W. Rugamer. *id.,* Wurtzburg, 1894. P. JUNGLAS, *id.,* Paderborn, 1908. J.TIXERONT, *Hist. Dogm.,* ni, p. 151-159; *Melanges,* p. 223-227. A. Michel, *Hypostase,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 397-399. V. Grumel, *Léonce de Byzance.* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 400-426. M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* 1 (1909), p. 104-108.

I. THE ADVERSARIES OF MONOPHYSITISM BEFORE LEONTIUS BYZANTINUS.

The denunciation of Monophysitism in the middle of the fifth century by *Theodoret*[3] and *Eusebius of Dorylæum*[^] had

[1] See below, p. 112, note. — [2] A. BAUMSTARK, *op. cit.,* p. 186-188.

Mbid., p. 188-189.

[4] E. Tisserant, in *Dirt, thiol.,* vjii, 286-291. F. Nau, in *Did. Bibl.,* in, p. 1099-1102.

[5] E. Tisserant, in *Did. thiol.,* vm, p. 283-289. F. Nau, in *Did. Bibl.,* in, p. 1098. —[6] A. Baumstark, *op. cit.,* p. 312-320.

[7] For the others, see the notes on each author. — [8] See above, p. 44.

[9] See above, p. 53- Already as a simple layman in 428 he denounced the Nestorian error.

led *Flavian of Constantinople* [1]*to condemn Eutyches. It was nevertheless at the beginning of the sixth century that the orthodox faith found the most defenders, both among the bishops and the monks.

A) Bishops.

1. Macedonius, Patriarch of Constantinople (496-511), composed a Patristic Florilegium which is described by Severus '.

2. Heraclianus, Bishop of Chalcedon (beginning of the sixth cent.), chiefly known for his long refutation of Manichæism[3], also wrote a treatise against Sotericus, Eutychian Bishop of Cæsarea[4].

3. John of Scythopolis (vith cent.) wrote a defence of the Council of Chalcedon about 515-520, and was, together with John the Grammarian, one of the chief adversaries of Severus, against whom he composed a whole book [5].

4. John the Grammarian (vith cent.), who was probably Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, is best known for his vigorous refutation of the *Philalethes* of Severus[6], who defended himself in a treatise. John's *Apology* for the Council of Chalcedon, which appeared shortly afterwards (515-520), caused even greater anxiety to the Patriarch, who replied in the 3 books of his *Contra Grammaticum*[7].*

5. Ephraem of Antioch, Patriarch from 527-545, before 540 was chief orthodox leader; before he became bishop he had been Count of the East. His writings, except for fragments [8], are lost. Photius mentions a collection of dogmatic letters and eight discourses[9], and gives various extracts from a treatise in 4 books in defence of the Council *of* Chalcedon [10].

B) Monks.

Among the monks who combated Severus of Antioch, it is enough to mention :

Nephalius (about 508) " who also wrote a defence of the Council of Chalcedon.

Jobius, one of whose treatises is analysed by Photius[12].

Eustathius, whose long epistle against Severus *(De duabus naturis)*[13] contains many extracts.

[1] See above, p. 53.
See J. Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien,* p. 126-127.
[3] Photius, *Bibl., cod.* 85; *P. G.,* 103, 287.
[4] J. P. Junglas, *Leontius v. B.,* p. 56-57.
[5] J. Lebon, *op. cit.,* p. 149-154. Cf. Photius, *cod.* 94, 107.
[6] *Ibid.,* p. 128-163. — [7] *Ibid.,* p. 147-163.
[8] *P. G.,* 96, (2) 2103-2110.
[9] Photius, *cod.* 228 *(P. G.,* 103, 957-970).
[10] *Ibid.,* 229 (Λ *G.,* 103, 969-1024).
[11] See above, p. 67. Cf. Lebon, *op. cit.,* p. 119 sq.
Photius, *ccd.* 222 *P. G..* 103/735-830). Fragments (Mai) in *P. G.,* 86 (2) 3313-332?·
[13] *P. G.,* 86 (1), 901-942.

Two groups of monks of very diverse tendencies took part in the controversies between the Catholics and the Monophysites.

The Acœmetæ [1], whose monastery at the end of the fifth century was one of the chief orthodox centres in Constantinople, were known for their dyophysite tendencies. They eventually came to deny the Θεοτόκο , and were condemned as Nestorians by Pope John π 9.

The Scythian monks, at the beginning of the sixth century, gave proof of quite contrary tendencies, and sought to win over the Monophysites by purely formal concessions without in any way sacrificing orthodoxy. It was for this purpose that they revived the Cyrillian expression *Units de Trinitate passus est in carne* [3]. They were rebuffed at Constantinople and also at Rome where four of them had gone to beg Pope Hormisdas' approval of their initiative. They persisted in their opinions in face of accusations of *Tkeopaschitism** made against them, chiefly by the Acœmetæ, and finally were approved by Justinian and the pope himself, John II [5]. The most outstanding among the Scythian monks was John Maxentius, some of whose writings are still extant[6]. There are no serious grounds for supposing that Leontius Byzantinus was one of them [7].

II. LEONTIUS BYZANTINUS.

A) Life and Works.

Very little is known of the life of Leontius. What information we have is summed up in the following short biography : " Leontius was born at Constantinople in the second half of the fifth century. In his youth he fell into the Nestorian heresy, from which, by God's grace, a group of wise and prudent men succeeded in saving him. Either before, or after his conversion to orthodoxy, he entered the Great Laura, a convent in the vicinity of Jerusalem, about the

[1] J. Pargoire, *Admites,* in *Did. Arch.,* col. 307-321. The name oí Acoeinetae or *non-sleepers* (ἀ-κοιμητο) is explained by their practice of perpetual psalmody *(lausperennis).* — [3] *Jbid.,* 318-319.

[3] S. Cyril, *Anath.* xn.

[4] See above, p. 58, 66.

[5] In the Act condemning the Acoemetae.

[6] *P. G.,* 86, I, 75-108 (Letters to the legates, 75-78, to the Pope, 91-I12; professions of faith, 79-86, 89-90; Dialogue against the Nestorians, 115-158). For their doctrine on grace, see below, p. 194.

[7] A *Panoplia dogmatica* (before 540) attributed to Pamphilus of Jerusalem (vith cent.) greatly resembles Leontius' writings. Mai, *Nava Pat. Bibl.* if, 295-662.

year 519-520 *, together with Nonnos, the leader of the Origenists, and a number of other monks. He accompanied Sabas to Constantinople in 531, where he took part in the Chalcedonian controversy. It was as a consequence of this that the great Abbot discovered him to be an Origenist and cast him off. At Constantinople he took part, together with Hypatios of Ephesus, in the conference between the Severians and the Catholics held at that time by order of Justinian. He remained at Constantinople while Saint Sabas returned to Jerusalem, probably took part in the Council of 536 against the Monophysites, and showed himself favourable, through his relations with the πάπα Eusebios, to the raising of Domitian and Theodore Askidas to episcopal sees. He is again found at the Great Laura in 538 and later at Constantinople, where he died in 542 " 2

It should be noted that, in spite of his close relations with the Origenists and his admiration for the great Alexandrian, only very vague traces 3 of what is called Origenism are found in his works, and these had no influence on his Christological teaching, which now forms our chief interest. It was in the latter question that his great doctrinal influence was particularly apparent 4.

He was a true theologian, endowed with a subtle and penetrating intelligence. His philosophy though eclectic, was concise, and had furnished him with a redoutable armoury of clear, sure and acute ideas. Further, since he was sincerely attached to tradition and the Fathers, he fully realised the radical agreement between the dogmatic definitions of Ephesus and Chalcedon. He set out resolutely to show this agreement, and notably to persuade the Monophysites that it was possible to be a Chalcedonian without being a Nestorian,

Only three of Leontius' certainly authentic works are extant. They were probably written at Constantinople between 531 and 538.

1 There are hardly any grounds for supposing that he should be identified with ihe Scythian monk, Leontius, who in 519 was a member of the deputation sent to Rome in order t· obtain the approval of the formula *Unus de Trinitate /assus est in Carne.*

3 V. Grumkl, *o/. cit.,* col. 401.

3 *Ibid.,* col. 424-425.

4 It has been said that he was the leading theologian of his time (Mai). It would seem, however, that the Patriarch *Èphraem oj Antioch* enioved an equal reputation, even from the point of view of theology.

1. **Libri tres adversus Nestorianos et Eutychianos**In the first book is established the distinction between the *ousia* and the *hypostasis* and thus refuted the two contrary errors of Nestorius and Eutyches. In the second, Aphthartodocetism is combated, while in the third, Theodore of Mopsuestia, the true propagator of the Nestorian errors, is taken to task. Each of these books is accompanied by Patristic flori leg ia.

2. **Solutio argumentorum Severi**, or *Epilypsis,* is a closely argued theological discussion in the form of a dialogue *.

3. **Triginta capita adversus Severum**3, forms a continuation of the Epilypsis.

Critics also attribute to Leontius the composition of a great work entitled *Scolia* \ of which fragments are presumed to be still extant in three writings bearing his name, but whose authenticity is not yet fully established : *Contra Nestorianos*5 *Contra Monophysitas*6, *De sectis* For a long time it was thought that he was the first to denounce the Apollinarist tactics of attributing to Catholic Doctors the writings of their own teachers; but it has now been proved that the *Adversus fraudes ApollinarislarunD* is by an unknown author, writing at an earlier date 9.

B). Christological Teaching'10.

The most outstanding· feature of the Christological teaching of Leontius of Byzantium is marked by the word Enhypostatoti, ¿γυποστατόν. This expression already existed, but he exploited it far better than his forerunners had done in order to show the agreement of the concilary decisions. Ih's *philosophy* was that Neo-Platonism he had learnt from the Fathers and Porphyry; it was through the latter also that he discovered Aristotle, with whose categories he made great play. He used philosophy, however, merely as a tool with which to penetrate the ideas of the *Fathers,* from whom he derived all his doctrine ".

The *Catholics* admitted two natures but only one hypostasis in Christ.

The *Nestorians,* on the contrary, affirmed two natures and two hypostases. The *Monophysites* recognised but one nature and one hypostasis.

I *G.*, 86, 1267-1396. —8 /Λ *G.*, 86, 1915-1946. —3?. *G.*, 86, 1901 1916.
4 Loofs' hypothesis, disputed by Junglas.
5 *P. G.*, 86, 1399-1768. — 6 *P. G.*, 86, 1769-1901.
i *P.* 6'., 86, 1193-1268. — 8 *G.*, 86, 1947-1976.
9 The sermons bearing his name (/< *G.*, 86, 1975-2004) are not his, nor is the *Rerum sacrarum liber foannis et Leoniii (P. G.*, 86, 2017-2100), which was perhaps written by St. John Damascene.
10 See V. Grumel, *o/>. cit.*, col. 404-426.
II Πάντα ἐκ πατέρων λαβών ἐχω. *Libri tres; P. G.*, 86, 1344·

The Nestorians and the Monophysites were thus agreed in identifying nature and hypostasis L They said to the Catholics: for you, the human nature is not a hypostasis; it must therefore be ανυπόστατο , that is, having no existence. Leontius replied: human nature is neither ὑπόστασι nor ανυπόστατο but ἐνυπόστατο . For a better understanding of this reply the meaning of this word in his philosophical vocabulary must be well defined.

Leontius carefully draws up the scale of realities : i) at the summit, *substance* (ούσια. in a wide sense) ; 2) *genus* (γένο) ; 3) *species* (είδο), composed of the genus and the specific differences (ειδοποιοί διαφοραί), also called essential qualities or essential properties ; 4) *nature* (φυσι), which is the species as realised in a concrete being; it is also termed ούσια in a strict sense; 5) the *individual* (άτομον), the concrete being in which the species is realised, comprises the entire species, and the individualising and distinctive characters (ιδιώματα άφοριστικά) which Leontius also calls inseparable accidents, to distinguish them from simple non-permanent accidents; 6) the *hypostasis* (ύπο'στασι), is the individual existing of itself (καθ' εαυτό) and in itself (έν έαυτφ) *. Leontius thus completed and rendered more precise the notion Saint Basil had already formulated 3. He observed in particular that this notion of hypostasis "only accords with individuals having a *physically* independent existence, and in consequence cannot be spoken of with respect to the parts of a whole, even should these parts be themselves natures or substances : 4 these parts exist and subsist, not in themselves, but in the whole " 5; they have their *existence only in another.*

Proceeding to apply these data to Christ, Leontius first remarks that a nature *without* hypostasis is an unreal abstraction ; but he shows that a nature may be neither ὑπόστασι nor ανυπόστατο (deprived of existence) and yet still *be:* it may be ἐνυπόστατο , if it has " being *in* another and not in itself "5. Enhypostasiated nature is not a hypostasis, since it does not exist in itself; but neither is it an accident, since, by hypothesis, it is a nature, i. e. a substance. This typical formula enables him to prove that to be φύσι is to be a concrete essence, real and individualised, without being necessarily ὑπόστασι . From these premises he is able to refute the two contrary errors which were based on the identity of these two concepts: Nestorianism and Monophysitism.

* With some difference, however, in practice. The Nestorians reduced the concept of person to the dominant concept of nature; the Severian Monophysites preferred to link up the concept of nature to that of person, which was for "them of greater importance. — 2 See V. Grumel, *op. cit.,* 405-408.

3 *p' 434* ~ *art· Hypostase,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 398.

s Ιο οε ενυπόστατον... ὸ *v.* ετερψ εχει το ε^αι κα; ούκ ^υτ- Όεωρ *P. G..* 86, 1277 *(Libri 1res).*

"Our author pointed out to the Nestorians that it is quite true that the τελεί (perfect) Word took to Himself a complete human nature, τελεία; but though these two elements, considered in themselves, are complete and perfect, they are not so when considered in relation to the Incarnate Word, of which they form the incomplete parts or elements, as do body and soul in relation to man. There is therefore but one Person in Christ" L The human nature of Christ, even complete, is not a hypostasis; it is only an "enhypostasiated" nature.

Leontius' teaching, however, made a more direct attack on Monophysitism. The ἐνυπόστατον excludes the concept of a specific *(abstract)* nature-essence, which the Severians, in spite of their declarations to the contrary, seemed to regard as the *immediate principle of* the human properties attributed to Christ2 3 If Christ's human nature is said to be *enhypostasiated,* its concrete and individual character is thereby affirmed ; it must be called a nature (οὐσι) in the proper sense of the word, and there is nothing to prevent it from being considered as distinct from the divine nature, even in the union of the two. Leontius accepted the Monophysite expression *ex duabus naturis,* which can be taken to mean either the formation of Christ by the union of two natures, or the state of Christ already existing, and composed "of two natures", that is to say, subsisting "in two natures" *(in duabus naturis).* This latter Chalcedonian expression should not be excluded from the preceding, which, although it is less clear, is none the less orthodox 3. On the other hand, the expression μία φύσι , which might rigorously be taken to mean μία ὑποστασι , is extremely dangerous and inexact; it was reluctantly tolerated by Leontius4.

Leontius considered that the comparison of the union of the body and the soul5 may be used with advantage to show that in Christ there is a substantial union of the two natures, that their respective properties remain intact and that both are possessed by one and the same person ; but it must not be allowed to suggest a monophysical *unity.* The real reason which shows that Christ is not one nature, as the body and soul form one nature in man, is the one just given, i. e., that in Christ, although His human nature is not a hypostasis, it is nevertheless

' J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 156.
3 See above, p. 68-69.
3 *Triginta capita,* in, IV, V, VI. See V. Grumel, *op. cit.,* col. 413.
4 See V. Grumel, *op. cit.,* col. 413-414.
5 See V. Grumel, *op. cit.,* col. 414 416.

" enhypostasiated " and hence a complete and individual nature. Leontius adds another and rather specious reason. A nature essentially supposes a relation to the species [*]. Body and soul form a nature because they suppose a species in which several individuals can participate, and "since what is said of the nature or the species can be predicated of each *of* the individuals, it may be said of each man that he is a μία φὐσι ,... but the case is not the same for Christ. The result of the union is not a Christlike nature (χριστότη , εἰδο χριστών), that can be participated: it is necessarily an individual, a single and incommunicable hypostasis; it is not therefore μια φὐσι . but μία ὑποστασι " s. This appears to be a less weighty reason than the former; but it at least shows to what an extent the author had carried his study of the problem.

Leontius' speculations were made use of by Saint John Damascene, and finally became a part of the great body of Scholastic teaching, of which the Byzantine theologian was a distant forerunner.

CHAPTER VII.

Justinian I.

4

Special Bibliography.

Editions: In addition to the conciliary collections, see *P. G.,* S6, and *P. L.,* 69, 30-37, 119, 177-328. Religious legislation in Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Imp. fust. Novelice,* 2 Vol., Leipzig, 1882. Abridged collection in *P. L., 'I2,* 921-1110.

Studies: Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles,* t. 11, 2nd. part, p. 1120 sq., and t. ill, p. 1-56. C. Glaizolle, *Un empereur théologien, Justinien, son rôle dans les controverses, sa doctrine christologique,* Lyon, 1905. F. 1)1EKAMP, *Die origenistischen Streitigheilen, ini VI Jahrhundert,* Munster, 1899. Ch. *V\v.w\., Justinien et la civilisation byzantine au VP siècle.* Paris, 1901. Cauvet, *Eemp. Justinien et son œuvre législative,* Lyons, 1880. A. Knecht, *Die Religionspolitik K. Justinians I,* Würtzburg, 1896. K. KruMBACHER, Gesch. byz. Lit., 1897. J. PARG01RE, *L'Eglise byzantine,* Paris, 1905, p. 11-41. M. JUGIE, *Justinien /*, in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2277-2290. Mgr L. DUCHESNE, *IlEglise au VP s.,* Paris, 1925.

1 There are only three cases, he observes, in which μία φὐσι may be said: in the case oí a species; in the case of an individual, inasmuch as it participates in the species; and, lastly, in the case of a new species resulting from the mixture of the two other species. None of these cases may be applied to Christ. See V. GrL'MEL, *op. at., ibid.,* col. 414. J. T1XERONT, *Hist. Dogn*tIll, p. 157.

»J. TlXEROXT, *Hist, dogai.,* IH, p. 157.

I. LIFE AND WORKS OF JUSTINIAN. HIS THEOLOGICAL INFLUENCE.

The Emperor Justinian took a considerable part in the religious struggles of his time; and his very real interference in theological matters was so important as regards the religious development of the Eastern Church that, however strange it may appear at first glance, this temporal prince cannot be omitted from any treatise on Patrology.

Justinian was born about 483 in Illyria (Macedonia)[1] of modest parents, probably Slavs[2] He received a thorough education. He was sent to Constantinople, where he engaged in serious juridical, military and even theological studies. This wide culture enabled him to give useful aid in governing the Empire, to his uncle Justin I (518-527), who had adopted him and who caused him to be crowned Caesar four months before his own death (in April 527). In 526 he had married Theodora, at one time an actress. The Empress was a fervent Monophysite, who often tried to use her influence in favour of her protégés, but she was never able to wean the Emperor from the true faith.

Justinian's long reign was glorious in every sphere, military[3], political[4] artistic[5], and even — of chief interest to us—religious, in spite of the many blunders that were made. "Justinian had formed an eminent idea of his obligations as a Christian Emperor. He began by giving an example of truly Christian life. He possessed deep religious convictions and his piety was sincere. He kept the fasts of the Church with regularity. He took a lively interest in theological controversy. Those who see in his religious policy no more than clever statecraft are grievously in error. The Emperor sincerely desired the good of the Church as well as that of the State. To his mind the prosperity of the former was a gage of the fortune of the latter. When he declared that his theological treatises or his dogmatic constitutions were

[1] To the south of Uskub in a village which later became the town *Justiniana Prima,* and even an archbishopric.

[2] To judge by the names of his father and mother and his own name, Upranda, which he abandoned later in favour of Flavius Anicius Julianus Justinianus.

[3] To mention only the conquests of Latin Africa, of Italy, and a part of Spain.

[4] The great juridical work *(Corpus Juris,* comprising the *Institutes,* the *Digest,* the *Codex,* the *Novella)* represents but a part of this work.

[5] That masterpiece of architecture, Saint Sophia, dates from 532-537.

the best safeguard of the Empire, he was voicing his real convictions and not mouthing empty phrases. The idea which guided all his religious policy was that of leading all the subjects of the Empire to Catholic unity" \

The Emperor'S sincere Christianity is apparent even in his civil or political work. The *Corpus Juris* is published " in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ", Whose name appears in the frontispiece. Father Pargoire remarks: "The Codex places, as the foundation of Byzantine civilisation and politics, the Catholic faith in the unity of God, the Trinity of the Divine Persons, the Divinity of the Word, the reality of His Incarnation, the unity of His Person and the duality of natures in Christ; the profession of faith that the Emperor had addressed to the Roman Pontiff, *the head of all the Churches,* was inserted as a law of the State"[2]. The clergy was associated in the Imperial legislative activity as well as in the actual application of the laws ; in its turn, however, it was also attained by a considerable number of laws, constitutions or novellae, which were due to the Emperor's initiative. Thus Justinian legislated as supreme master "for the episcopal elections, on the rights and obligations of bishops, on the number of the clergy, on ecclesiastical property, on the formation and government of monasteries, on the novitiate and profession of monks, and on a thousand other questions of the same nature"[3]. His intentions, no doubt, were of the best, and actual measures he carried out were often no less excellent. In reality, however, they were an ever present affirmation that a wholly Pagan idea of the divine all-powerfulness of the State formed the basis of the Imperial Constitution. This idea was destined to corrupt the most happily inspired initiatives, by reason of the error it contained, and the evil results of which it was the cause.

Justinian recognised the effective primacy of the Bishop of RomeL No one was more zealous, when Justin I came into power, in putting an end to the schism of Acacius. In 519 he approved and got others to approve the formula of Hormisdas, which he later reproduced in a letter to Pope John II (Sth June, 533) inserted in the Codex[5]. In a letter to Pope Hormisdas he said : " The unity of the holy Churches derives from the teaching and authority of your apostolate (Apostolic Church) "[6]. He worked therefore " to subject and unite to the See of Rome " all the priests of the East"[7]. It is a fact that in the course of the more serious

1 M. Jugik, *op. cit.,* col. 2278.

2 J. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* p. 75. See *Codex* I, II.

3 j. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* p. 76.

‹ See *ibid.,* p. 44-46. M. JUGIE, *op. cit.,* col. 2285-2286.

s *Codex,* I, I, 8; *P. L·.,* 66, 17-20. I

6 Unitas sanctarum Ecclesiarum per *doctrinam* et *auctoritatem* apostolatus vestri provenit. *Ep. ad Hormis.; P. L.,* 63, 474.

i Itaque omnes sacerdotes universi Orientalis tractus et *subjicere* et *unire* Sedi Vesine Sanctitatis properavimus. *P L.,* 66, 15.

differences he had with certain Popes, he never doubted the authority of the "Apostolic See" in spite of his errors, notably that of his celebrated distinction between the See and the person of the Pope. Justinian did not act more consistently as regards the privileges of the patriarchs of Constantinople on whom he conferred, in spite of opposition by the Popes, the primacy of the East, and even the title of "Head of all the other Churches" (of the East), as well as that of " (Ecumenical Patriarch " 1. To his mind, the bishops of the five great sees or patriarchates represent the whole Church, and the metropolitan bishops must submit to them, just as the patriarchs are subjected to the Bishop of Rome, who is the first amongst them2. Further, he explicitly declares " that no one doubts that the sublimity of the Sovereign Pontiff is at Rome "3. But in spite of such categorical affirmations, he contributed in no little measure to obscure the clear teaching of the Roman Primacy both by his conduct, which was little in keeping with his principles, and above all. by his tendency to dominate the pontiffs themselves.

He carried his secular intrusions even farther, for he took part in many doctrinal controversies, and although a simple layman claimed to settle them with authority.

From Justinian's letters it is apparent that his first interference was in the question of the *Scythian monks* and their expression " Theopaschite " 4. His first impression was that their enterprise was futile. Later, however, the monks won him over to their way of thinking, but he endeavoured in vain to obtain for them the approval of Pope Hormisdas about the year 520. Papal approbation was witheld until 533 under John II (532-535) at a time when the Acoemetae persisted in regarding the Pope's silence as a tacit condemnation of the teaching of Chalcedon on the communication of characters5.

Justinian condemned Monophysitism chiefly in two documents: I. A *constitution* in 536 against *Anthimus,* the Monophysite Patriarch of Constantinople, who had been named through Theodora's influence and deposed on the firm instance of Pope Saint Agapetus: Justinian

' Nov. cix, CXXXiii; Nov. ni, v, vi, xvi etc. Cf. M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* 2286.

3 Ut Sanctissimi quidem patriarchæ ad vestram faciant Sanctitatem, metropolitani vero patriarchis. *P. L.,* 66. 43.

3 Nov. IX.

4 See above, p. 73.

s Eight of Justinian's letters to Hormisdas (514-523) deal with this matter. Two others, to the same Pope, concern the end of the schism of Acacius. Three are extant to other Popes (to John II, dated 553, on the Scythian question; to St. AgapeLus two letters in 535, 536); another, a little earlier than the 26th May 553, instructs the Council to condemn Vigilius. Two others are addressed to bishops.

confirmed this sentence against Anthimus and his fellows, Severus of Antioch, Bishop Peter of Apamea and the monk Zoaras, all great Monophysite leaders[1]*—2. A *Treatise against the Monophysites"*[1], written in 542 or 543 on the occasion of the conversion to Catholicism of a certain number of Alexandrian monks. It consistsofa dogmatic letter explaining the orthodox faith and refuting by means of the Scriptures and the Fathers, the Christological heresies, notably the teaching of Severus.

At the same period, Justinian took up arms against Origenism. in a work *(Liber adversus Origenem)*[3] addressed to the Patriarch Mennas. Having been sollicited by the Patriarch of Jerusalem [4] to take measures against the Palestinian Origenists[5], Justinian decided to turn Doctor. He presented Origen as father of all the heresies and without any distinction attributed to him all the errors which then flourished under the protection of his name[6]* These he refuted by quotations from the Fathers, especially Saint Cyril and the Cappadocians, and brought his book to an end with *ten anatheniatisnis*[1] which were approved by an Act of the *permanent Synod* presided by Mennas in 543 [8]. Justinian completed his work with a "Letter to the Holy Synod on Origen and his followers"[9], which appears to have been sent to the same Synod. Others, however, incline to think that it was sent to the Council of 553, which really seems to have discussed the question, at least in its preliminary sessions in which 15 other canons against Origenjsm were formulated [10].

The Origenist leaders, however, were clever enough to turn the Imperial attention away from themselves by concentrating it on others. They suggested to Justinian the possibility of winning over the Monophysites by means of a concession consisting of the condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa, three men most cordially detested by all Monophysites. Thus arose what was later called the question of the Three Chapters ". No more attractive or insidious proposition

[1] *Constitutio saeta contra Anthimum, Severum, Petmm et Zoaram. P. G.,* 86, 1095-1104. This is Novella XLiI.

[•] *Tractatus contra Monofdiysitas ad monachos qui sunt in domo Alexandria. P. G.,* 86, 1103-1146 (Mai's text, incomplete). This treatise was preceded by a dogmatic letter (to the Patriarch Zoilus of Alexandria) of which a fragment is still extant. — [3] *G. P.,* 86, 945*994-

[4] And by the future Pope, Pelagius, at this time apocrisarius at Constantinople.

[s] This sect had been extremely turbulent since their leaders, Theodore /Xskidas and Domitian, had been raised to the episcopate.

[6] See Vol. I, p. 220.

[?] DeNZINGER-B., *Enchiridion,* n. 203-211.

[8] See Vol. I, p. 305.

[»] *P. G-.* 86, 989-991.

[10] See Vol. I, p. 220.

*· It was a question of *a)* the person and the works of Theodore ; ¿) Theodore's writings in favour of Nestorius against Saint Cyril and the Council of Ephesus · ; *c)* Ibas' letter to Maris.

could have been made to Justinian, who earnestly desired to bring back the powerful dissident sect of Monophysitism to the unity of Catholicism. To this end he had already had unsuccessful recourse to religious conferences between the two opposing camps (531-534) [1]. Although he was then constrained to employ coercion, he did not give up the idea of making advances to them on another occasion; in this he was discreetly abetted by his clever Empress. In consequence he published in 544 an edict condemning the Three Chapters [2] but which explicitly maintained the entire authority of Chalcedon. The four Patriarchs, followed by the Oriental episcopate, consented to subscribe to this document, but without enthusiasm. But it was the Pope's approval that mattered for Justinian. He did everything to obtain it. It is important to know how he achieved his purpose and what was the outcome. We shall thus be able to arrange in their historic background the last theological writings [3] of the untiring Emperor who until his death persisted in busying himself with theology [4], and who, towards the end, endeavoured to impose the Aphthartodocetism of Julian of Halicarnassus[5] on the entire Church. Death came to put an end to this scheme in 565.

II. JUSTINIAN AND THE THREE CHAPTERS.

Justinian looked especially to Pope Vigilius for the condemnation of the Three Chapters. He did not stop at theological argument in his efforts to obtain it; he even had recourse to force. It was said that Vigilius[6] (538-555) was raised to the Papacy by the support of Theodora, and that in return he promised to favour her religious policy. Whatever may have been the case, it is at least certain that once he

1 Their only result was to increase the confidence of the Monophysites, who, thanks to Theodora's intrigues and support, were successful in having one of their men, Anthimus, named Patriarch of Constantinople. See above, p. Si.

2 Only fragments of this edict are extant.

3 The *Confessio* (see p. 84) and three letters, one dated 5th May 553 to the Fathers of the Council (*P. G.*, 86, 1035-1042), the other read on the 26th May 553 to the Council, and the third, a veritable treatise, written after the Council, perhaps in 555 (*P. G.*, 86, 1041-1095).

4 Various liturgical writings are attributed to him, notably the celebrated troparion Ὁ Μονογενής. See V. Grumel, in *Echos d'Orient,* 1923, p. 398-418.

5 See above, p. 64.

6 See below, p. 150.

had become Pope he began to gain a deeper realisation of the duties of his office and refused to act on suggestions emanating from Constantinople, lie had at his back the whole of the West, which saw nothing to be gained by a condemnation of the Three Chapters. Summoned, and probably brought by force, to Constantinople in January 548, Vigilius finally yielded, and on the nth April 548 gave his *Judicatum* [1] by which the Three Chapters were condemned, without prejudice to Chalcedon. Faced with the protests of the Western Church he withdrew this document in the following year. The Pope and the Emperor entered into a mutual agreement to take no measures, for or against the Three Chapters, before the convocation of a new Council.

The Emperor, however, failed to keep his word and precipitated a serious conflict by his interference in doctrinal matters. In 551, at the instigation of Theodore Askidas, he published his *Confession,* a kind of lay encyclical for the purpose of promulgating the faith that was officially recognised by the State. It treated especially of Christological matters'. The royal theologian set himself out to show the agreement between Ephesus and Chalcedon and to answer the Monophysite objections according to Leontius Byzantinus: to count the natures docs not imply their division ; Christ's human nature never possessed its own hypostasis or personality, but existed in the hypostasis of the Word. This explanation was followed by thirteen anathematisms, of which the last three were directed against the Three Chapters; hence the general title given to this document. The Pope was greatly displeased with the Emperor's behaviour and took no pains to hide the fact. Theatened with violence from many quarters and judging his palace to be no longer safe, he took refuge in the church adjacent to the palace of Hormisdas in August 551, and later in the Church of Saint Euphemia of Chalcedon. It was while living in the latter that he deposed Theodore Askidas and withdrew from communion with Mennas. Both of the latter, however, at the Emperor's instigation gave way to the Pope, who was able to return to Constantinople in 552. On the 6th January 553 he received the profession of faith of the new Patriarch, the successor of Mennas, who had died in the preceding August. This brought the long quarrel to an end ; but another of greater consequence was fated to arise out of the new Council.

It was Vigilius' wish that the Council [3] should be held in Italy. He refused to take part in any Council from which the Emperor had systematically excluded all representatives of the Latin East, and the African bishops [*] in particular. In spite of his opposition the Council opened on the 5th May

[1] *P. L.,* 69, in (fragments). — [2] *P. G.,* 86, (1), 993'1035.
[3] Sec Hefele-Leclercq, ZZ/rA *des Cone.,* in, 1st P., p. 20-140.
[*] There were but six Latin bishops (from Africa) at the first session, and eight at the last.

with about 160 bishops, most of whom were Orientals. After three unimportant sessions, the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Ibas were examined in the 4th, 5th and 6th sessions. They were judged to contain ample matter for condemnation. Meanwhile the Pope was following the deliberations from without, and bided his time On the 14th May, before the fifth session, he published a long memorandum, the *Constitutum**, in which he gave his authoritative judgment on the disputed questions. According to Tixeront, this is one of the best literary compositions bequeathed to us by the sixth century [3]. Vigilius maintained the withdrawal of his "Judicatum " of 548, and while blaming Theodore's errors refused to condemn his person. He acted in like manner as regards Theodoret and Ibas, who had been rehabilitated at Chalcedon. Justinian was becoming more and more impatient, and on May 26 the Council in its 7th session, acting on the Emperor's suggestion, made for the first time the distinction between *sedes* and *sedens;* it disassociated itself from the Pope, while claiming to remain in union with the Apostolic See at Rome [4]. This done, the Council continued its labours *against the Pope* and in the 8th and last session promulgated 14 anathematisms, differing very little from Justinian's (in his *Confessional* 551). After having condemned several heresies, it anathematised Theodore of Mopsuestia (person and works: XIIth anathema), Theodoret (works against Ephesus and Saint Cyril : XHIth anathema), Ibas (letter: XIVth anathema). In spite of appearances these decisions were not in contradiction to the Council of Chalcedon [5].

The Emperor had no difficulty in obtaining the subscription of the 164 Oriental bishops present. The Western bishops refused, and several were banished[6]. It is possible that Vigilius was also exiled. In any case he finally

[2] The deacon, Pelagius, urged him to resist.

[3] *P. L.* 69, 67-114. —[3] *Hist. Doliti.,* in, p. 143.

[4] "Servemus itaque unitatem ad apostolicam sacrosanclæ ecclesia sedem antiquioris Roma". Mansi, *Cone.,* ix, 367. The traditional faith was so evident that even in this quarrel Justinian had no desire to cut himself off from *the Sec* of Rome, and did not dream of attributing any of its privileges to the See of Constantinople; this throws some light on the meaning of the Patriarch John H's prologue to the formulary of Hormisdas. See above, p. 63.

[5] Sec J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm,,* in, p. 147-149. Cf. above, p. 56.

[6] Among the exiled may be mentioned the deacon Pelagius, who after Vigilius' submission and before becoming Pope himself even wrote against the Pope.

finally yielded and confirmed the Council in a letter to the Bishop of Constantinople on the 8th December 553 \ and by a second *Constitutum*2 contrary to the first, which was perhaps addressed to the Latin bishops (Feb. 23, 554). The Council of 553 thus became the *Vth Oecumenical Council*3.* Many Western Churches refused to accept its decisions, and the Council gave rise to many schisms which were prolonged in many cases to the end of the seventh century.

The outcome of Justinian's religious policy was unfortunate. The violence to which he had had recourse and his interference in the spiritual domain militated against him, in spite of the excellence of his intentions in his attempt to prove to the Monophysites that the Council of Ephesus was not annulled by that of Chalcedon. The Monophysites, however, were not sincere; they were not converted and, in a certain measure, even won the day. At the very time that Justinian began his campaign in their favour against the Three Chapters, Jacob Baradæus, the man who was to give a stable organisation to Monophysitism, also came into the field 4.

CHAPTER VIII.

Dionysius the Areopagite5.

Special Bibliography :

Editions: *P. G.*, 3, 4 (Venetian edit., 1755-1756). French trans., G. Darboy, Paris, 1845; J. Dulac, Paris, 1865.

* *P. L.*, 69, 122-128. — 2 *P. L.*, 69, 143-178.

3 As regards Vigilius' attitude, see below, p. 151. It has been averred that the Council of 451, which declared Theodoret and Ibas to be orthodox, was contradicted by that of 553 which condemned their writings as heretical. But this is quite inexact. In the *first examination* there was chiefly question of a judgment on persons based on their actual declarations and a summary inspection of their writings (examined only for formal declarations of heresy). *In the second,* the writings were examined on their own merits and in the light ol a century of controversy which had shown the harmfulness of ambiguous expressions. The declarations of the Councils must be understood in the sense in which they were made. — ♦ See above, p. 70.

5 Although this author was a *pseudo-Areopagite,* and probably a *pseudo-Dionysius,* we think it neither necessary nor useful to give him this qualification every time we have occasion to mention him.

Studies: *Commentaries* of St. Maximus the Confessor (seep. 308,, of St. Thomas Aquinas (see p. 550) and of Denys the Carthusian (see p. 708). General Studies : G. Darboy, *Œuvres de saint Denys l'Aréopagite* (Introduction), 1845. M. SCHNEIDER, *Areopagitica,* Regensburg, 1884. Fr. Hipler, *Dionysius der Areopagite,* Regensburg, 1861. J. Drase KE, *Gesammelte patristische Untersuchungen,* Altona, 1889. J. Stiglmayr, S. J., on Proclus, as Dionysius' source, in *Hist. Jahrbuch,* 1895 (t. 76), 253-273, 721-748; on the history of the Areopagite writings, Felkirch, 1895. H. Koch, on Proclus and Dionysius, in *Philologus,* 1895, (t. Liv), 438-454; on Dionysius and neo-Platonism, Mainz, 1900. De Smedt, S. J., *Rev. des quest, historiques,* 1896, p. 610. P. PeeterS, S. J., *La vision de Denys I'Areopagite (i Héliopolis,* in *Anal. Boll.,* 1910 (t. xxix), p. 302-322; ibid., 1912, p. 5-10; 1921, p. 277-313. G. Théry, on Hilduin's translation, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1925, p. 33-50, 197-214. See also H. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* I, col. 455-459· O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte,* IV, p. 282-299. P. Godet, *Denys PAreopagite (le Pseudo),* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 429-436.

I. THE WRITINGS ASCRIBED TO DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE.

It is during the Monophysite controversies that we first hear of a powerful and original work bearing the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. This work was destined to have great influence in the Middle Ages, when it was put almost on the same footing as the inspired writers. It purported to be a work written by Saint Paul's disciple. It comprises two treatises concerning God and the knowledge of God *(on the Divine names* and *on mystical theology),* two treatises dealing with a twofold hierarchy *(on the celestial hierarchy* and *on ecclesiastical hierarchy),* and ten letters, (three letters extant only in Latin are not due to the same author although they bear his name).

i. On the Divine Names This work, which Saint Thomas considered well worth commenting[1], is the Areopagite's fundamental theological work. It is composed of thirteen chapters. The first three constitute the general introduction : *a)* The *Scriptures* form the *only* means of knowing God; His attributes are expressed in the names given to Him in its pages (ch. I), *b)* These names refer sometimes to the *nature* of God, sometimes to the three Persons, sometimes to one Person: rules to be followed in this matter (ch. Il), *c)* Prayer is the necessary condition for

[1] *P. G.,* 3, 585-996.
[8] *Opera S. Thorn., opuse,* vii; ed. Parm., t. XV, p. 259-405.

a knowledge of God, Who reveals Himself only to those who draw near to Him; the author intends to follow in all things the example of his venerated master, Hierotheus «, and to complete his teaching. 'I he ten chapters which form the body of the work deal successively with the names given to God in the Scriptures and explain them in a way which furnishes an extremely pure, intelligible and spiritual idea of God, stripped as far as possible of all imagery; this method is characteristic of the author.

In this treatise God is respectively considered ᵡ : i) as *goodness light, beauty and charity* (ch. v): (numbers 1l-17, *on love,* should be specially noticed; its nature, its extatic character, its order; *evil* is also treated al length in the last numbers, 18-35, °f hie same chapter, with reference to the title of Good which is given to God); 2) as lhe *being* in which all things participate (ch. v); 3) as the *life* from which all other life proceeds (ch. Vi); 4) as *wisdom* and *truth* (ch. Vil); 5) as *power, justice* and *l edemption* or salvation (ch. vili); 6) as *great* or *little, like* or *unlike, immovable* or *in movement* (ch. IX); 7) as *containing all things* and *immortal* (ch. X); 8) as *peace* (in this connection the author treats of the Divine *aseity)* (ch. X1); 9) as *Holy* and as *King* (ch. Xi 1); 10) as perfect and as *one:* the "one " is the basis of all else (ch. Xlll) ; in this last chapter the whole treatise is summed up, and it is clear that the author's purpose is to lead his disciple to a pure knowledge of God by excluding multiplicity. The mystical interest of lhe book will be discussed below.

2. The Mystical Theology 2 is a tiny work in very few pages, divided into five chapters. It teaches and recommends another knowledge of God (θεολογία), which is secret, mysterious (μυστική) and nobler than the preceding one. This knowledge comes from God; in prayer He reveals Himself in the midst of a " superluminous " obscurity of silence, which opens the way to the mysteries (κρυφιομύστου σιγή)3.

‘ According to Dionysius, this Hierotheus had written an elementary treatise on theology, *Theologica elementa (Div. nom.,* Il, 9-10; in. 2-3), and love songs, *Hymni amatorii (Ibid.,* iv, 16-17). Should these details, which are not confirmed by any other testimony, be taken literally? Was this Hierotheus a contemporary of the Apostles', as Dionysius himself claims to be? Was he a real person living in a later century, or merely a creature of fiction? There is no certain answer to any of these questions.—As regards the *Book of Hierotheus on the Hidden Mysteries of the Divinity,* preserved in Syriac, it seems to be posterior to the writings of the Areopagite, who appears to have suggested this title himself and inspired lhe author. See above, p. 70.

• *P. G.,* 3, 997-1064 (with Cordier's and Pachymère's notes and commentaries). The Greek text is entirely contained in cols. 997, 1000, 1001, 1025, 1032, 1033, 1040, 1048.

3 Ubi simplicia et absoluta et immutabilia theologiae mysteria aperiuntur, in "superluminosa" silentii arcana docentis caligine quæ in obscuritate tenebricosissima (ens; superciarissimum perresplendens ; c. I, n. I (literal transcription from the Greek).

The preparation por this silence of the mind so favourable to mystical contemplation is accomplished by denying to God all created perfections, beginning with the most gross, rather than by predicating particular perfections to Him. When the soul comes to the highest perfections it remains completely passive (δλο ἀφωνο ἑστα'.) and fully united to the Ineffable (ὁλο ενωθήσεται τω ἀφθέγκτφ) T. In the last chapters is explained the absolute transcendence of God 2.

3. On the celestial hierarchy 3.—On the ecclesiastical hierarchy 4. The theme of these two parallel treatises is a mystical theory of the author's on *sanctification* to which he gives the name deification (θείωσι). According to him, this deification comprises three successive operations; purification, illumination and perfection (κάθαρσι , φωτισμό , τελείωσι). This threefold action is not immediately due to God, who acts indirectly through intermediaries that are subordinated one to the other, thus constituting a hierarchy. The latter's function is therefore to unite souls to God 5; but it must nevertheless constantly look to God, Who directs all knowledge and every action, in order to reproduce His traits in others 6. There is a double hierarchy, one angelical and celestial, the other ecclesiastical and terrestial ; a treatise is devoted to each.

I'he treatise on the celestial hierarchy comprises 15 chapters. The central and most important part of the work explains the division of the angels7 into three hierarchies of three orders each8: the first hierarchy

[*] *Theol. mysl.,* c. in (end). The remainder of the text is as follows: Nunc vero ab inferioribus ad id quod supremum eminet, ascendens (oratio) juxta modum ascensionis contrahitur, et post omnem ascensum penitus obmutescit, atque ineffabiliter (Deo) tota conjungitur. — 2 See below, *negative theology,* p. 96.

"De Calesli hierarchia ; P. G., 3, 119-370.

4De Ecclesiastica hiérarchie,; P. G., 3, 369-5S4.

5 Scopus igitur hierarchise est Dei, quanta fieri potest, assimilâtio conjunctioque. *Cal. hier.,* Ill, 2.

6 Ad divinissimum ejus decorem constanter intuendo, eumdem quoad potest exprimit. *Ibid.*

7 "Dionysius" thinks that all the angels possess the same *essence* and are distinguished only by their *degree* of perfection. *Cael. hier.,* C. V.

8 The Fathers had established various lists of the angelical orders, counting 7 (St. Irenaeus), 8 (St. Greg.of Nyssa), and even 11 (St. Greg. Naz.), but the most usual, after the 4th cent., is that which numbers 9: angels and archangels, the five orders mentioned by St. Paul *(Ef>h.* 1, 21; *Col.* I, 16); cherubim *{Gen.* Ill, 24) and seraphim according to Isaías (vi, 2). This enumeration is found notably in St. Cyr. Jerus. *(Cat.* xxm. 6), St. John Chrysost. (In *Gen.,* XV, 5) and the Apostolic Constitutions (vili, 12). It is adopted and subdivided by Dionysius according to his own principles.

(Seraphim, Cherubim, Thrones) receives purity, light and perfection from God: it then transmits them to the second *(Dominations, Virtues, Powers),* which then communicates them to the third hierarchy *(Principalities, Archangels, Angels).* Whilst it is the duty of the second hierarchy to watch over the general wellbeing of all creation, the third, which is closer to us, must help the human race, the nations and each one of us. Thus every man, according to his capacity may receive a threefold power and participate in the purity, light and perfection of God (ch. x). Throughout the work. Dionysius supposes the angels to be spiritual, simple, intelligible and intelligent beings.

The "Ecclesiastical Hierarchy" (in 7 chapters) is a kind of mystical and symbolical liturgical treatise. After having shown in the first chapter that the ecclesiastical hierarchy has similar functions to the heavenly hierarchy (purification, illumination, perfection), the author treats of: 1. The *rites* by which this triple ministry is accomplished: Baptism (ch. 11), the Eucharist or Synaxis (ch. in), confirmation or chrismation (ch. iv); 2. The *consecralors,* and the consecrations, of which the former are the subjects, i. e., the ordinations of bishops, priests and deacons (ch. v); 3. The *consecrated* or *initiates,* i. e., the catechumens and penitents (to be purified), the faithful (who are gradually enlightened by tending to perfection), the monks or perfect, who are subjected to a special initiation (ch. Vi). Chapter VII deals with funeral ceremonies.

The idea of the three spiritual ways seems to be best insinuated at the beginning of this chapter. But it is no more than an insinuation, and even here, is considerably dififerent from that taught by ascetics and mystics in the Middle Ages.

4. The letters of the Areopagite are for the most part, addressed to persons bearing the names of disciples of the Apostles: to Cains *(Ep.* I-IV), to Dorotheus (v), to Sosipater (vi), to Polycarp, bishop (vil), to Demophilus (vili); of the last two, one was written to Titus, Saint Paul's disciple (ix), and the other to "John the Theologian, Apostle and Evangelist, exiled in the isle of Patmos" (x). The 1st (on the knowledge of God), the Vth (on the Divine obscurity) and the IXth (on wisdom and the twofold theology) are especially valuable for a proper understanding of the author's mystical teaching.

Dionysius mentions the titles of seven other writings he claims to have written or which he planned to write[1]. It may be wondered whether these are not fictions pure and simple, and whether these works, of which no trace remains, were ever published.

[1] *P. G.,* 3, 1065-1120.

[3] *Theologica outlines, Symbolic theology, On the human soul, On the objects of intellect and sense, On the Hierarchy of the Old Testament, On the Righteous judgment of God, Sacred Hymns.*

II. THE AUTHOR OF THE WRITINGS ATTRIBUTED TO THE PSEUDO-AREOPAGITE.

The author dedicated all his writings to his friend and disciple, Timothy. He takes the name of Dionysius [1] and obviously claims to be the Areopagite converted by Saint Paul[2]. He seems to imply that he was present at the death of the Blessed Virgin 3;* on this occasion he saw *James,* the brother of the Lord, and *Peter,* "the highest and earliest summit of Theology"[4]; to *Saint John the Evangelist* he predicts the end of his exile[5]. Whether they were real persons or not, there is no doubt that it was to the Apostles' disciples that the letters were written.

In the religious conferences of 533 the Severian Monophysites cited these writings as Apostolic, but the Catholics rejected them as apocryphal. In the end, however, their authority was accepted even by the Catholics. This was mainly due to Saint Maximus in the East[6] (d. 662) and, in the West, to Saint Gregory the Great, who quoted them with veneration, and Pope Saint Martin, who invoked them at the Lateran Synod in 649. They were popularised by the Latin versions of Hilduin and Scotus Erigenus in the ninth century, and had a considerable influence in the Middle Ages, which put them in the forefront of the Apostolic writings. Saint Thomas[7][8] frequently quotes all the writings of the Areopagite and even comments the *Divine Names*[8] (the other commentaries on Dionysius which are attributed to him are spurious). The *Celestial Hierarchy* was explained by Hugh of St. Victor[9] and Albert the Great[10], and the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* by Saint Bonaventure[11]. At that time, theologians, ascetics and mystics, liturgists and even artists, found inspiration in the works of the "Areopagite".

With the coming of the Renaissance fresh doubts were raised on the authenticity of these writings. Several Catholic scholars of the seventeenth century regarded them as spurious, while others maintained their authenticity. The controversy was renewed in the nineteenth century with even greater warmth. The Abbé G. Darboy (1845), a future archbishop, defended their entire authenticity[12]. Fr. Hipler in

1 *Ep.* vu, 3. — 2 *De div. noni.,* 11, 11; in, 2. — 3 *De div. noni.,* ill, 2.

4 Πέτρο , ἡ κορυφαία και ιτρεσβυτάτη των θεολόγων ἀκρατη . *Ibid.* By theologians, Dionysius means the writers of the New Testament.

5 *Ep.* X. — 6 See below, p. 307.

7 See J. DURANTE!., .S'. *Thomas el le Pseudo-Denys,* Paris, 1919.

8 *Obus Theol.*. vu. Sec below, p. 550. — 9 See p. 447. — 10 See p. 490.

11 If the work (ed. Vives) is really his.

12 Introduction to the *Œuvres* (Fr. trans.). Among those who adopted the same outlook in France may mentioned, Freppel *(Cours d'éloq. sacrée,* '860-1S61, 5th lesson), Vidieu *(S. Denys l'Aréo.,* Paris, 1S89); in Germany, Schneider *(Areopagitica,* Ratisbon, 1884); in Italy, Bertani (Milan, 1878); in England, J. Parker (1897).

Germany attempted at least to défend the good faith and the sincerity of this Doctor, who was so venerated in the Middle Ages, by seeking some historical background in the fourth century which would accord with the information he furnishes At the end of the nineteenth century, however, the Jesuit, Stiglmayr and H. Koch definitely proved that even this hypothesis could not be maintained.

The Areopagite's writings were composed, between 480 and. 530. The first date depends on two arguments : *a)* the author is a disciple of Proclus (cl. 485), whose treatise "On the existence of Evil" is quoted almost word for word in the "*Divine Names*"[1], and with whose philosophy he is familiar[2]; *d)* he was acquainted with the custom, introduced at Antioch in 476 by Peter Fullo of singing the *Credo* during Mass[3]. On the other hand his books were already quoted by Severus at Constantinople in 533. They were therefore written previous to that year. It is perhaps possible to reduce even more the period between the two extreme dates, since quotations from the Pseudo-Dionysius are found in Severus even before 513, at the Council of Tyre, while, on the other hand, it appears to many authors that his Christological teaching resembles that of the *Henoticon* (482) ; he avoids using the terms *one* and *two natures,* and speaks so well of a "new theandric operation"[5], that the Monophysites had recourse to his writings. At bottom, however, his doctrine is perfectly *orthodox* both on this point and all others. Even did he live in surroundings hostile to the Council of Chalcedon, he evidently maintained a peaceful attitude as regards the controverted questions. The entire work, therefore, which was undoubtedly composed by one author, was written in the neighbourhood of the year 500.

The author, who evidently followed the lessons of Proclus (411-485) at Athens, probably lived in *Syria,* (rather than in Egypt). Before his conversion he was in all likelihood a neo-Platonist. It is thought that he was a monk and afterwards a bishop; this last inference is based on his " noble idea of episcopal privileges and the courage he showed, so convinced was he of the sanctity of the monastic life, in repressing the monks' claim to privileges proper to the secular clergy. His was certainly the mind of a philosopher, lacking neither in originality nor power "[6]. The

1 According to this writer, "Dionysius" lived in Egypt in the fourth century; his name really was Dionysius (possibly Dionysius of Rhinocolurus, Sozom., *Hist.,* vi, 31); the title of Areopagite was merely a symbol. He did not claim to be Saint Paul's disciple, and the persons to whom his writings are addressed are all real and identifiable, although they bear fictitious names. This is an ingenious and attractive thesis, but it could not stand up to the facts brought by Stiglmayr and de Koch. Hipler and Draseke, its principal defenders, avowed as much. See p. 6, n. 4.

2 *De div. nom.,* Ill, 18-35.

3 See p. 39.

4 *Eccl. hier.,* Ill, 2.

5 Μία θεανδρική ενέργεια. *Ep.* iv.

6 P. Godet, *op. cit.,* col. 432-433.

author's style, which Bossuet[1] qualified as extraordinary, is extremely poor. It has been said of Dionysius that he had "a mania for long, involved and pretentious phrases"[2]. He is obscure and affected. His prose bristles with neologisms, taken even from the ancient mysteries; he habitually substitutes for the usual names of bishop, priest, deacon and monk, the terms *hierarchies, hierus, liturgus* and *theiapeutus*. Nor, it is true, does he avoid expressions "redolent of emanationism"[3]; but these are corrected by the work as a whole whose orthodoxy cannot be doubted. The author's dissimulation must be regarded chiefly as a *literary fiction,* a device to which early writers had frequent recourse. The Areopagite must have thought himself justified in employing such an artifice since his thesis provided an answer to one of the problems which was then very much to the fore in the minds of the thinkers of the time. It demonstrated that the neo-Platonist conceptions of a simple being, the source of all being, and men's aspirations for union with this perfect being, were better realised in Christianity than in philosophy.

III. THE TEACHING OF DIONYSIUS THE AREOPAGITE.

It was thus the purpose of the Areopagite to place neo-Platonism at the service of the Christian faith. Fie himself explains his intentions in the letter to Polycarpi. His teaching is primarily *mystical,* but it is based on a philosophy and culminates in an original *theological synthesis.* These three points, will be treated successively.

A) Philosophy.

The author's philosophy is neo-Platonism as systematised by *Plotinus* and taught at that time by *Proclus.* The fundamental idea of the Plotinian system is that of a *universal progressive emanationism:* the One produces the Intellect (Νου) which produces the World-Soul (Λόγο) from which all beings gradually proceed, until matter, which is pure nothingness, pure evil and the limit of the creative power of the Being, is attained. But neo-Platonism is a *religion* as well as a philosophy. It teaches the mystical return of the soul to the *One,* in three stages: 1)*purification* or the emancipation from matter; 2) *illumination* (by reason, and then by direct contemplation of the intelligible world

[1] *Instruction sur les ¿tats d'oraison,* I, a., 2.
[2] P. Godet, *op. at.,* 433.
[3] *Ibid.* — [4] *Ep.* vil, i, 2.

or the Intellect); 3) *ecstasy* or union to the *One* by means of a confused contemplation in which the soul is deprived of all consciousness

Proclus (411-485), the chief representative of the School of Athens in the fifth century, taught the essentials of Plotinian philosophy but increased the number of *triads:* " the triadic progress constitutes the dynamical idea of his philosophy"'. The Intellect of course emanates from the One by the intermediary of unities (henades), but itself divides into three spheres which in their turn are subdivided into triads (and hebdomads): matter is one of the products of the triads of the Nov and not, as in Plotinus' system, a final degradation of the World-Soul. For the soul's return to the *One,* Proclus recommends, in addition to Plotinus' intellectual effort, the use of various *rites* such as Iamblichus had employed (theurgy).

Such is the philosophy that Dionysius employed in order to make a deeper study of the Christian faith. It afforded him exceptional powers of penetration, but all the firmness of his faith was needed to keep him within the bounds of orthodoxy. He adopted the general *method of* neo-Platonism, correcting it when occasion arose; he even retained the same *terms,* but gave to them quite another meaning which permits of no confusion between the two doctrines. It need cause no surprise that this attempt at conciliation was not altogether successful; Dionysius had undertaken no easy task and is hardly to be blamed should some few doubtful expressions have crept into his work. The points on which he especially purified the teaching *of* his Pagan masters are best seen by studying his mystical and theological doctrines.

B) Mystical Doctrine.

Intellectualism [illegible]; the dominant feature of the Plotinian teaching, is found in Dionysius' mystical theology (by this should be understood a special insistence on the function of the intellect); but this has been tempered by the characters proper to his asceticism : 1) prayer, in the proper sense of the word, is the basis of Dionysius' contemplation ; 2) God, Who is the end of contemplation, although He dwells in an inaccessible light, is nevertheless a truly concrete reality, to Whom souls may be united through love; 3) virtue, by which man is able to approach nearer to God, does not consist simply in an emancipation from the grosser instincts, but in a true positive effort to "become better" by imitating the goodness of God.— It has been said that Dionysius was

' See Vol. I, p. 168· 170.
- M. DE WULF, *Hist. de. la philosophie médiévale,* p. 126 (5th ed. p. 122).
3 See Vol. I, p. 170. Cf. *ibid.,* p. 642.

the first author to employ the classical division of the *three ways* in ascetic teaching. It should be noted, however, that the three words *purification, illumination, perfection,* which occur so often in his works do not always signify the three successive ways of the soul's spiritual ascent to God, but rather the *three special modes* by which the divine perfections are participated by creatures, first by the angels and then by men [1]. This participation comes from God Himself, chiefly through the intermediary of the hierarchies [2]. Dionysius' division is mystical rather than ascetica. Indeed, all his work, and notably his theological teaching, possesses a mystical tendency, although he gave to only one of his works the title of "mystical theology" in a strict sense.

All his work either paves the way for contemplation or manifests its fruits. Thus the theology or doctrine of the *Divine Names* was destined to throw light on the Divine attributes; by its stressing of the transcendence of God and the unity of His Being it leads the reader to a pure idea of God *(theology)* and by this means puts him on the road to that simpler and still purer knowledge which is contemplation or *mystical theology* in the proper sense of the term [3]. Similarly the teaching of the two *Hierarchies* tends to the same end; the three operations which constitute its theme all envisage a profound knowledge of God, prepared by purification, communicated by illumination and brought to its full perfection in the soul by sanctification.

Although the general character of the three works we have mentioned precludes them from being called mystical, except in a wide sense, they contain many pages wherein the author

[1] The concept of the *ways,* however, is at least suggested in ch. vi of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy,* where the catechumens, the faithful and the monks seem to represent the three stages of perfection. See above, p. 90.

[2] See the abstract above, p. 90.

[3] *Ascetic* signifies chiefly man's moral activity, while *mystical* means the superior action by which God brings souls to a state of perfect charity, and especially to that eminent knowledge of God which is the condition of the former. See Vol. 1, p. 20-22.

[4] In modern times, theology is taken in a wide sense to signify all the study of the truths of faith, or these truths is themselves, i. e., dogma as a whole. Theology is *mystical* when, because of its object, it treats of the mystical graces, or when because of its symbolical or affective method it disposes the soul to contemplation. Formerly theology was taken in a narrower sense to mean the *knowledge of God,* the Divine Nature and the Trinity, which is the primary object of faith. This knowledge is either discursive, or when symbolism or the negative method is employed, mystical. *Contemplation* may be called a nobler infused and passive mystical theology.

writes mystical theology in its strict signification. Thus, at the beginning of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* he declares that the end envisaged by all the orders of which he is going to speak is a "constant love of God and Divine things... the vision and knowledge of sacred truth, a divine participation in the simple perfection of Him Who is sovereignly simple, and the enjoyment of that contemplation which nourishes the soul and deifies all who attain to it" h This mystical teaching is found to an even greater extent in the treatise on the *Divine Names.* It is here that Dionysius employs his celebrated expression, commented by Saint Thomas, regarding the knowledge that is obtained not only by study but by an impression of the divine (ού μόνον μαθών, άλλα καί παθών τα θεία) a kind of sympathy (καί εκ τή προ αυτά συμπάθεια) 2* Further on, this knowledge is described as being eminently divine (θειοτάτη τού Θεού γνώσι) transcending human intellect and resulting from a supernatural light which illuminates for the soul the unsoundable depths of wisdom 3. Elsewhere he insists especially on charity which tends to draw man out of himself and deliver him up to the object of his love: divine love tends to ecstasy 45 and through it man is disposed for a proper reception of this light: it is vouchsafed to souls which, like Saint Paul s, are in some manner taken out of themselves; but who, on the other hand, as Dionysius remarks in the first chapter of his work6, have no vain presumption.

It may be wondered in what exactly consists this mystical knowledge properly so called, which has so much attraction for Dionysius. It forms the subject of the little treatise "On Mystical Theology". It is to be distinguished not only from affirmative theology but also from negative theology, which is a different but nevertheless very real form of mental activity. Silence, repose, relative obscurity which are produced in the soul by the negation of the attributes usually ascribed to God are able to open a way to that light of which we speak ; but they do not constitute it or bestow it, for it is infused; a work of grace and of the Holy Ghost ; it is ή του Πνεύματο θεολογία 7.

Dionysius describes this theology in the prayer with which the treatise commences: "Eminently divine, sovereignly good, supra-essential 1 rinity, guide of Christians in sacred wisdom (θεοσοφία) lead us to that

' *Eccl. Hier.y* i, 3.

* *De div. ntm.,* II, 9. Non solum discens sed et patiens divina. Cf. *Sum via theoì.*ii»-n*, ψι. 45, art. 2. — 3 *Ibid.,* VII, 3.

4 Εστι δέ και εκστατικό ό Οε'ο έρω , *Ibid.,* ιν, 13.

5 *Ibid.,* ιν, 13. — 6 *Ibid.,* ι, 2.

7 *Myst. theol.,* in.

sublime height of the Scriptures (των μυσικών λογιών) which is beyond all demonstration and surpasses all light. There, unveiled, in themselves and in their immutability, appear the mysteries of ' theology ' in the midst of an extremely luminous obscurity of silence, filled with profound teaching: 1*a marvellous obscurity shining with a splendid brilliance, and which, since it cannot be grasped by the mind nor seen by the eyes, floods with the beauty of its fires the souls of those who are blessedly blind Such is the prayer I make 8".

The author immediately goes on to point out to his disciple on what conditions he may obtain such gifts: "As for you, O well beloved Timothy, practise unceasingly mystical contemplations (τὰ μυστικὰ θεάματα). neglect the senses and the workings of the understanding (τὰ νο-ρὰ ἐνεργεία), all that is of matter and of the mind, all the things that arc and are not, and with a natural impulse go, unite yourself as closely as is possible to Him Who is raised far above all essence and all concept. For it is by means of this sincere, spontaneous and total abandonment (ἐκστάσει) of yourself and of all things that, free and delivered from all hindrance, you will throw yourself into the mysterious brilliance of the divine obscurity " (προ την υπερούσιον τού θειου σκότου ακτίνα)3.

Beneath the tortured and emphatic expressions of this " extraordinary" style is found the exaltation of a "theology" which, considered in its essential elements, is no other than a profound and simple perception of God, independent of all active mental elaboration, received from God as a very special participation in His wisdom. It is, in a word, *infused contemplation* or contemplation properly so called4. Though he by no means overlooks them, it was not the author's intention to throw into any special relief either the preponderating part of *faith* in the act of contemplation5, or that of charity6, or the higher working of the *Holy Ghost* through intelligence and wisdom7, or the series *of graces,* by which it is vouchsafed8, or the *natural foundation* that contemplation finds in the intimate constitution or structure of the human soul naturally turned towards the true and the good, from its very first contact with being 9.10 Dionysius was chiefly impressed by the radical difference which distinguishes infused contemplation from the reasoned and acquired knowledge of God. That is the reason why he stresses so much the necessity of abandoning the latter in order to obtain the former; hence his favourite doctrine of obscurity, the source of light,0,

' See «above, p. 88.

' *Ibid.,* I, I. This translation from the French of Mgr. Darboy does not altogether preserve the tone of the original Greek; but it is at least exact and has the advantage of clarity.

3 *Ibid.,* I, I.

4 See Vol. I, p. 22-25 and below p. 359.

5 As did St. John of the Cross. See p. 830.

6 As St. Bernard or St. Francis of Sales. See p. 435 and 850.

7 As St. Augustine or S. Thomas. See p. 614.

8 As St. Teresa. See p. 814.

' As St. Augustine. See p. 515.

10 Γνόβο ὑπέροωτο . *Myst. theol.,* n, Γνο'φο ἐστί πό απρόσιτον φω . *Efist.* V.

and all those violent antitheses[1]*of which he was so fond and to which he gave too free a rein. His attachment to this teaching is further explained inasmuch as he saw in it the application of another doctrine that was dear to him. This was the teaching on the divine transcendency' which he had inherited from neo-Platonism and which he tended to exaggerate. He justified himself moreover by quoting Saint Paul who says that God dwells in inaccessible light (i *Tim.,* vi, 16), that His ways are unfathomable *{Rom.,* XI, 33) and that His peace is beyond all understanding *{Philipp.,* tv, 7)[3].

The foregoing teaching has wrongly appeared to some to be not only difficult to understand but also erroneous. The author may indeed by reproached perhaps with being too onesided, but there are no grounds for accusing him of Pantheism [4] or of identifying contemplation with intuitive vision in this world. Dionysius sometimes seems to deny the efficacy of demonstrative theology and to incline to agnosticism [5]; but it should be remembered that his chief purpose was to show the advantages of "mystical theology". Considered from this aspect, it must be confessed that his work is singularly powerful.

He enjoyed considerable authority, especially' in the Middle Ages, and in a sense it may be said that he was the father of "theoretical mystical teaching". Previous to Dionysius no one had ever treated the subject so exhaustively. There had, of course, been mystics in the Church, and several, Saint Augustine in particular, had spoken of the eminent graces that go with holiness[6]. The latter indeed, when treating of wisdom, had given amore complete explanation, both from mystical and philosophical viewpoints. Dionysius' work, however, being more specialised, had the advantage of drawing an almost exclusive attention to the mystic state consisting in infused knowledge of God. In that consists the originality of his work, the reason of its worth and also its defects[7]. Like all human labours, it is not without its shortcomings: traces of the author's neo-Platonism are too apparent[8]; nevertheless the impression of divine things is even more evident, and it is this which made it, and causes it to remain, a truly great work.

[1] He also associates very frequently the idea of silence with that of obscurity and light; he speaks of γνόφο κρὺοτομύστου σιγή , *hfyst. theoI.,* I, 1. Contemplation supposes that the soul is utterly silent: ὁ/.ο ἀφωυο ἐσται. *Ibid.,* in. Here, there is question of infused contemplation properly so-called which is independent of the activity of the faculties. This silence, moreover, may be the work either of the soul disposing itself to the reception of grace, or of grace which predisposes the soul.

[3] See below, *Demonstrative theology.* — [3] See *Ef>ist.* V.

[4] Although some of his writings were misinterpreted in this sense by several of his disciples. — [5] See below, p. 92. — [6] See Vol. 1, p. 686-688.

[7] His onesidedness. — [8] See above, p. 92 sq.

C) Systematic theology.

Systematic theology, or the rational (demonstrative) study of revealed truth, is, as has been seen, closely bound up in Dionysius' work with " mystical theology", whether as an introduction to the latter or as its result. We may, however, consider it apart in order to compare it with that of other Doctors. In spite of appearances *philosophy* has but a secondary role in this work, that of a probe. The true source of his teaching is Holy Scripture, which the author quotes incessantly and for the interpretation of which he uses and abuses the allegorical method. His method has been compared with that of Porphyry and Proclus commenting Homer and Plato. It woulc be more just perhaps to compare it with that of the great Alexandrians [1].

Dionysius' teaching is especially abundant as regards three points: i) The Divine attributes; 2) the angels; 3) the Sacraments. His Christology has given rise to difficulties of which a word must be said.

1. The Divine attributes. God is the *centre of* Dionysius' theology; a large part of his work deals with the Divine perfections. His mystical tendencies induced him to give an extremely high, pure and simple idea of God. To his mind absolute *unity* seemed to be the fundamental characteristic of the Principle of all being; the imperfect is multiple, but all the good, all that is positive in its content, is a multiplied expression of the absolute unity of its principle. God is rightly called ζολυοίνυμο *(multinominatus)* [2] and all the qualities of inferior beings can be affirmed of Him; in that consists *affirmative* theology. But God transcends all these qualities and all the concepts we have of Him; hence the possibility, on the other hand, of denying Him everything we know of Him in order to arrive, not at His indetermination (as did the neo-Platonists) but at His transcendence. In Dionysius' writings affirmative theology finds its counterpart in *negative* [3] theology, which is the basis or initial form of the *via eminentia:* or *via excellentice* of which the Scholastics speak. Dionysius marks the affirmative way by the frequent use of the words αυτό, ἀρχι (αὐτόφω , ἀρχίοωτον); while the other is seen in the use of the privative *a* (ανώνυμο) or by υπέρ (υπέρσοφο). It should again be noted that negative theology is not "mystical theology" but, on the contrary, leads toit, or may in a sense be said to derive from it, since one who has been gifted with contemplation will be inclined, in demonstrative theology (by affirmation or negation), to form an ever simpler and purer idea of God.

2. The angels. Dionysius the Areopagitc contributed to the spread of the doctrine of the wholly spiritual nature of the angels, regarding

[1] See Vol. I, p. 207-208.
[2] *De div. nom.*, I, 6; II, 3, II.
[3] *Di div. nom.*, IX; *Theol. myst.*, r, 2; ill, IV; *Eccl. Hier.*, 11, 3; *Ep.* 1, ix, r.

which the Fathers, both in the West' and the East', had not yet made any clear declaration. He regarded the angels as celestial substances (ουράνιοι ούσι'αι) 3, superior to the world (υπερκόσμιοι) \ of (lodlike simplicity (ϋεοειδεστάτη ἁπλότη) 5, leading a wholly intellectual life (νοεράν ἐχουσαι την πασαν ζωήν)6. This teaching, which was adopted and spread in the East by Saint Maximus7 and in the West by Saint Gregory the Great8, ended by taking first place and became usual in the teaching of the Church. The influence of the Pseudo-Dionysius was no less important as regards the arrangement of the angelic choirs : it is due to him that the division into three hierarchies of three orders9 each has finally acquired right of place in theology. Although he attributes to the lower 10 1 hierarchy the care of the welfare of mankind, he does not seem to have spoken of the functions of the *guardian angels,* either of nations or of individuals, a doctrine which is already found in Saint Cyril of Alexandria".

3. The Sacraments. Having spoken of the sanctifying function of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, Dionysius found it necessary to insist on the rites by means of which these functions are fulfilled. He mentions

1 Saint Augustine himself admitted only a relative spiritual nature for the angels, and this, not for philosophical reasons (his Platonism would rather have led him, like Saint Gregory of Nyssa or Dionysius, to take up a contrary attitude), but on account of various passages in the Scriptures (especially concerning the apparition of angels; *Ep.* 95, 8), which seemed to him easier of explanation had the angels a body, although so subtle and spiritual in nature that they may still be considered as spirits. See also *De Civ. Dei,* bk., XV, XXIII, I; bk. XXI, X, I, Saint Hilary, like many other early Fathers, applied to the angels the words "Sons of God" *{Gen.,* VI, I, 2), which imply that they possess a l>ody; elsewhere, however, he calls them "spiritual and incorporeal". Saint Ambrose attributes similar qualities to them and yet supposes that it is possible for them to be unchaste. Saint Jerome, like Saint Augustine, protested against the application of the words of Genesis to the angels, but made no pronouncement as to their nature. See J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Dogm.,* it, p. 273-275; 372-373· Cf. Robert, in *Rev. Biblique,* 1895-1896, 3 articles.

3 Saint Gregory of Nyssa seems to admit their pure spirituality; Saint Gregory of Nazianzus hesitated, but Saint Basil attributed a subtle body to the angels, as did also Saint Cyril of Jerusalem. A similar opinion in also found in Theodoret and in Anastasius Sinaita (viith). Since at that time it was customary to distinguish between " body and matter, gross matter and subtle matter ", J. Tixeront is of the opinion that we should not think that absolute spirituality is always affirmed by those authors who refuse a body to the angels, or who, like Saint John Chrysostom, would not apply the above mentioned passage from Genesis, to the angels. See J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Dogm.,* p. 133-135; HI, 202-203.

' *Cal. hier.,* IV, 2; X, I. — ‹ *Ibid.,* iv, 1, 2. — 5 *Ibid.,* IV, I. — 6 *Ibid.,* IV, 2.

7 In his scholions on Dionysius. See p. 308.

* *Moralia,* it, 8. Elsewhere, however, he writes as did the early Fathers. He says, for instance, that although thev are spirits, they are as bodies if compared with God. See J. Tixeront, *liist. Dogm.,* in, p. 341.

9 See above, p. 90. J

Many theologians, giving to the word archangel the sense of superior angel, do not regard Saint Michael, Saint Gabriel, Saint Raphael as archangels in the strict sense of the word, as members of the last hierarchy, according to Dionysius* classification. I

11 In *Rs.* 33, V. 8 ; in *Rs.* 49. v. 4. *R. G.,* 69, 888, 1078.

six'[1], of which four are Sacraments : Baptism, the Holy Eucharist, Confirmation, Holy Orders, monastic initiation and funeral ceremonies. The first three rites, being those of Christian initiation, are treated together'[2]. With regard to *Baptism,* the importance which Dionysius gives to the sanctification of the waler[3] and the purifying power *of* the sacred rife[4] should be noted. Similarly, with respect to *Confirmation,* it is noteworthy that the oil with which the baptised person is anointed has previously been consecrated by the bishop[5]. It is beyond doubt that the Areopagitc admits the reality of the *Eucharistic*[6] presence, although it is not easy to find any explicit mention *of* it in his confused text. He regards the power of *order* as one of the most important; he ascribes to it three functions : purification, which is proper to deacons; illumination, which is the special charge of priests ; lastly, union with God, by which the Christian is made perfect, is proper only to bishops[7]. The rite he describes for funerals cannot be *Extreme Unction* since it consists of anointing the bodies of the dead[8]. Dionysius recognises that lhe priest has truly the power of absolving sins *{penance)* and condemns the monks who in his time already claimed to be able to administer this Sacrament[9].

4. Christ. Although Christ occupies a lesser place in lhe Areopagitica than does the Godhead, He is nevertheless sufficiently studied. It has been said that the author was a Monophysite, either because this was first alleged by the Severians, which is not a sufficient reason ,[0], or because of his fourth Epistle which speaks of "a new *theandricopera-tion of* a God made man " ". But this expression, misinterpreted by Monophysites and Monothelites alike, can be taken in a Catholic sense, if the distinction of persons in Christ's personal unity is admitted. Although lhe author employs neither the expression δύο φύσει nor that of *μία* φύσι ", his leaching is orthodox. He affirms that one of the hypostases of the Trinity, Jesus, who is simple, united Himself by composition (συνετέθη) to a complete unchanged and unconfused human nature '[3].

Dionysius the Areopagite had many other interests, and seems to have been careful to avoid in this matter the current Christological controversies. His attitude was prudent, nor can he be reproached with it, since he had never claimed to treat the subject *ex professo.* It would be unjustifiable for present day critics to attribute to him the defence of a position which he had no desire to adopt. His doctrinal influence was exercised in many other questions and was especially strong in the Middle Ages.

[1] *Hier. Etcì.,* II-VII. See above, p. 90. — [2] *Ibid.,* 11, 2, 7; 3, 8.
[3] *Ibid.,* II, 2, 7. — [4] *Ibid.,* 11, 3, I. — [5] *Ibid.,* IV, 2, 7; 3, 8. — [6] *Ibid,* 3, 12.
[7] *Ibid.,* v, I, 5, 6. — [8] *Ibid.,* vi I. — [9] *Epist.* vin (to Demophilus).

At the most it proves that the work was first known, and written, in the regions they inhabited.

[10] Τήν θεανδρικήν ενέργειαν *ήμίν* πεπολιτευμενο . *Ερ.* ιν.

[12] Either on account of lhe Henoticon, or for the sake of peace.

[13] *De div. novi.,* I, 4.

CHAPTER IX.

Secondary Authors.

Exegetes, orators, ascetics and historians.

Special Bibliography: See the notes on each author.

I. EXEGETES.

The last great exegetes to have produced original and really important works were *Saint Cyril,* representing the School of Alexandria, and *Theodoret* that of Antioch. Compared with these two, the other authors who deserve mention are of but secondary importance.

1. Ammonias of Alexandria, priest and administrator of that Church in the fifth century, composed good commentaries on various books of the Old and New Testaments; fairly lengthy fragments of these are preserved in the Catenae. In 458 this author signed the letter of the Egyptian Bishops to the Emperor, Leo I, in defence of the Council of Chalcedon *.

2. Hesychius of Jerusalem, a monk and priest of this Church, who died after 431, enjoyed great doctrinal authority in Palestine, chiefly on account of his Scriptural studies and *commentaries.* The most important of these exegetieal writings deal with Leviticus, the Psalms, the Prophets and various books of the New Testament. Several of Hesychius' famous *sermons* on the Blessed Virgin (two on the Annunciation and one on the Purification) and possibly two others on the Apostles are also extant. He had, in addition, composed an *Ecclesiastical History* of which only one chapter on Theodore of Mopsuestia is extant, preserved in the Acts of the Vth Council which condemned the Three Chapters.

* See above, p. 23-25 and 41-42.

On the Psalms, Daniel, St. Matthew, St. John, Acts of the Apostles. I *Ep.* of St. Peter. *P. G.,* 85, 1361-1610, 1823-1826.

Anastasias Sinaita attributes to him polemical writings against Julian of Halicarnassus *(Pia dux.* 13, 14); but he probably confuses him with another Ammonias who lived in the sixth century.

P. G., 93, 787-1180 (Latin translation, with amendments to the original text, consisting especially in the use of the Vulgate: probably authentic.)

Dt titulis Psalmorum, P. G., 27, 649-1344 (of the Pseudo-Athanasius; Antonelli's edition, 1746); *In Psalmos, P. G.,* 93, 1179-1340 (Cordier's edition).

P. G., 93, 1339-1388. — *P. G.,* 93, 1387-1448. — *P. G.,* 93, 1453-1478.

P. G., 93, 1477-1480. Discourses 1-3 *(ibid.)* are not his, nor the two ascetic centuries on temperance *(P. G.,* 93, 1479-1544), which belong to another Hesychius in the sixth or seventh century.

Mansi, *Com.,* ix, 248. It is mentioned by Pelagius in an unpublished work indicated by Duchesne *(Hist, am.,* HI, 345).

3. Tiieodulus, a priest *of* Celcsyria, who died under Zeno (474-491 wrote a treatise *De consonantia divina: scriptura, id est Veteris et Novi Testamenti* ', and also, according to Ebed Jesu[2], a commentary in two volumes on Isaías, and a treatise on the characteristics of the Psalms of David. Only fragments of these latter are extant.

The work of such authors[3] was original, but they could not rise to the heights of the great exegetes of the preceding period. Other writers, well aware of this superiority of the early Fathers, invented about this time a new kind of exegetical work, imitated from the *Scholia* then in use on classical and juridical works. These were the Catenae, which, says R. Devresse, must be carefully distinguished from the Patristic *florilegia* containing texts from the Fathers, which were used for the purpose of confirming doctrinal arguments or defending the teaching of the Church against heretics. The florilegia were evidently theological or apologetical rather than exegetical. The Catenae, on the other hand, were running commentaries on the Scriptures, consisting of a simple transcription of the best passages of earlier commentaries concerning the parts of the Scriptures in question. The works employed in these compilations were not only those of the great exegetes but also secondary authors, whose works no longer extant, have thus been rediscovered, sometimes in scattered fragments and sometimes nearly complete, in these great collections. The Catenæ are found in Greek, in Syriac, in Armenian, in Ethiopian and in Copt. The first author known to have adopted this literary fashion in Greek was Procopius of Gaza[4].

'Gennadius, *De viris ill.*, 90. — 2 Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.*, in, I, 37.

3 The following are writers who belong rather to the latter part of the period now under discussion, i. e. vith and viith cent. :

a) Gregory II, Bishop of Agrigentum (Sicily), died about 630; *P. G.*, 98, 741-1182.

Œcumenius, Bishop of Tricca (Thessaly), vith-viith cent, rather than the Xth, according to Diékamp: *P. G.*, 118-119 (Comm, on the Acts of the Apostles and all the Epistles).

‹·) Andrew, Bishop of Cæsarea, in Capp., Vith cent. : /< *G.*, 106, 215-458 (on the Apocalypse).

d) Peter, Bishop of Laodicea, viith cent. : *P. G.*, 86 (11), 3323 3336 **fig**-ments). On St Anastasius Sinaita, St Maximus and Saint John Damascene, see below.

4 See chiefly R. Devresse, *Chaînes exég. grecques,* in *Diet. Bibl., Suppl.,* col. 1084-1233. See also P. BATIFFOL, *Chaînes bibliques,* in *Did. bibl.,* col. 482-487. The word *catena* or *chain* (σειρά) is but rarely employed by Greek writers, who prefer the word Ἐκλογαί, *selected extracts.* Edition of Catenæ of the N. T., J. A. Cramer, Oxford, 1840.

Procopius of Gaza [1] was the most outstanding among the representatives of the School of Gaza [2], which in the fifth and sixth centuries was especially famous for its teachers of Rhetoric. Many of these joined to their study of eloquence an interest in doctrinal matters. Some, like Æneas of Gaza [3], refuted the neo-Platonist philosophers, while others like Procopius threw themselves into a study of the Scriptures. Procopius composed a long catena on the *Octateuch,* but this is no longer extant. It is thought that it served as a source for the famous catena on the Octateuch which is still preserved [4]. He also wrote an "abridgment" *(Epitome)* which ran to somewhat considerable length, although for the most part the early texts are summarised and not given in full; but these commentaries [5] rarely diverge from the impersonal style which was preferred by the author. The same must be said of his great commentary on Isaias[6] and his scholia on the historic books (Kings and Paralipomenon)[7]. Among other authors of catenæ may be mentioned the Antiochian priest, Victor (5th cent.), and the Alexandrian deacon, Olympiodorus [8] (7th cent.).

II. ORATORS.

In the East, *Saint Cyril of Alexandria* and *Theodoret* were the greatest masters of eloquence, and also the greatest exegetes. There are a number of other authors, however, who are worthy of brief mention, in addition to *Hesychius ofJerusalem,* who is perhaps better known as an exegete.

[1] Edition: (7., 87 (1, II, in). *Studies:* E. LlNDL, *Die Oktateuchkatene des Prokop, von Gaza,* Munich, 1S92.

[3] J. Seitz, *Die Schute von Gaza,* Heidelberg, 1S92.

[2] Æneas of Gaza, a contemporary of Procopius, was the author of *Theophrastus,* a dialogue on the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. *P. G.,* 85, S71-1004.

[4] This is one of the many catenæ already edited (see the list in A. Harxack, *Geschiihte,* I, p. 835-842). Recent study: J. DecoNNINCK, *Essai sur ta Chaîne de ΓOctatetique,* Paris, 1912 (see *Pull. liti, eccl.,* 1912, p. 376-379). On the Catenæ of the Prophets, see M. Faulhaber, Freiburg im B., 1899.

[5] *P. G.,* 87, 24-1080.

[6] *P. G.,* 87, 1817-2718.

[7] *P. G..* 87, 1079-1220. The authenticity of the commentaries on Proverbs *(ibid.,* 1221 1554; 1779-1SS0) and the *Canticle (ibid.,* 1545-1780) is not altogether certain.

[8] *P. G.,* 93, 469-780. R. Devresse remarks that a methodical study of the catenæ is yet to be made.

H

1. **Gennadius of Constantinople**, who was Patriarch of this town from 458 to 471, was both an exegete and an orator, according to his namesake, Gennadius of Marseilles, who calls him "vir lingua nitidus et ingenio acer" Unfortunately, nothing remains of his "numerous homilies", and only fragments of his exegetical and doctrinal writings are extant[9].

2. **Basil of Seleucia** (d. 459), a bishop in Isauria, was at Constantinople at the beginning of the Monophysite controversies: at the outset he condemned Eutyches, gave way at Ephesus in 449, but came back to orthodoxy in 451, and died in peace and communion with the Church. He enjoyed some reputation as a preacher. Forty-one sermons bearing his name[1] are still extant, but their authenticity is not absolutely established except for the 15 mentioned by Photius[4]. The latter, who compared Basil with Chrysostom, as far as his exegetical method is concerned, finds his style affected and pretentious. He also attributes to him a poem on Saint Thecla. This poem is not to be confused with the life of the Saint in two books which is edited together with the sermons[5].

3. **Antipater of Bostra**, in Arabia, numbered among the great bishops by Leo I in 458, given honourable mention at the Council of 487, an adversary of the Origenists and Apollinarists (whom he refuted in a treatise of which fragments are extant), was also a distinguished preacher. All that remains of his work, however, are two homilies (on St. John the Baptist and the Annunciation), together with fragments of other sermons[6].

4. **Theodore of Ancyra**[7], in Galatia (died between 438 and 446, a bishop who showed great zeal in defending the Divine Motherhood of Mary, wrote a work (no longer extant) against Nestorius, in six books. He also established the divinity of the Holy Ghost in a treatise of three books which is likewise lost. A commentary on the Nicene Creed[8,9] and six homilies[9] are extant; others are known through extant fragments[10] or from references found in other works The first three consist of a refutation of Nestorianism The 4th and 6th treat of the Blessed Virgin. The latter is of special interest. "Both as regards its literary form and its doctrinal matter (Marial theology) it ranks with the best productions of Greek homiletics"[13].

[1] Gennadius, *De viris illusi.* 89.
[3] *P. G.*, 85, 27-474.
[4] *Biblioth.*, cod., 168.
[5] *P. G.*, 85, 477-560.
[6] Antipater's extant work, *P. G.*, 85, 1763-1796.
[7] M. Jugie, Introduction to the *Byzantine Marial Homilies* in *P. O.*, 19, 289-293.
[8] *P. G.*, 77, 1313-1348.
[9] *P. G.*, 77, 1349-1432.
[10] *P. G.*, *JJ*, 1431-1432.
[11] In the Acts of the viith Council, the linci of Nicaea (787).
[12] Also found in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (431).
[13] M. Jugie, *op. al.*, p. 291. This author gives the previously unpublished Greek text of the homily, *op. cit.*, p.

5. **Chrysippus of Jerusalem** born in Cappadocia at the beginning of the fifth century, became a monk, together with his two brothers, about 425-430, in the monastery of St. Euthymius in Palestine, where he remained until his death in 479. He was a priest in 455 and became custodian of the True Cross in 467. Of the "numerous writings" he is said to have composed, we possess only four discourses, three panegyrics (on Saint Michael, on Saint John the Baptist and on Saint Theodore) [1], aud a homily on Our Lady, in which, remarks Father Jligie, there is "a long passage in which Chrysippus explicit/ states the problem of the Immaculate Conception" [2].

6. **Abraham of Ephesus** [3], famous monk, founder of a monastery at Constantinople and another at Jerusalem before becoming Archbishop of Ephesus, is known as the author of two recently edited homilies, one on the Annunciation, the other on the Presentation of Jesus in the Temple[5]. These are especially interesting for the details they contain regarding the history of the feasts of Our Lady, and form a useful supplement to the accounts given in the homilies of the two preceding authors [6].

7. "**Eusebius of Alexandria**" [7] is the pseudo-author of an early collection of extremely obscure sermons, which are edited under his name[8]. According to a so-called biography written by his secretary (?), "John", the Alexandrian monk, "Eusebius", had been chosen by Saint Cyril to succeed him. After becoming· a bishop he wrote the sermons in question, in which he explains his teaching to his disciple "Alexander", who was one day to take his place. All this is pure invention [9]. The collection, which at the outset probably contained no more than sermons 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 16, 22 (in which "Alexander" questions "Eusebius" and leads him to speak of the subject *of* each sermon) and also perhaps sermons 3, 5, 9—the others are found in various manuscripts under divers titles—is the work of an unknown author, probably a clerk of orthodox faith who lived in the fifth or sixth century. He resembles the pseudo-Dionysius in the wide use he makes of pseudonyms and fiction.

[1] Life according to Cyril of Scythopolis (Life of St. Euthymius). Sec S. Vailhé, *Chrysippe, prêtre de Jérusalem,* in *Rev. Or. chrét.,* 1905 (t. X), p. 96, 99. Cf. M. JUGIE, *Marial Homilies,* (Introduction), *P. O.,* 19, 293-297. — Hesychius of Jerusalem, his contemporary, mentioned above, p. 102, may be compared with Chrysippus. Timothy, priest of Jerusalem, also deserves mention. In the fifth or sixth century (before 535) he composed a homily on the Purification, which contains a very interesting witness to the Assumption. See M. JUGIE, in *Echos d'Orient,* 1926 (t. 25), p. 2S6-290.

The first has never been edited; the second is to be found in Latin in COMHEIis, *Ribl. cone.,* vu, 803-806; the third in Νέα Σιών Jerusalem, 1911.

[3] M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* 296. This author here re-edits the Greek text *(op. cit.,* 336-343), first published in the XVlith cent.

[4] See M. Jugie, *Marial Homilies,* (Introduction), in *P. O.,* 16, 429-441; historic, literary and doctrinal study. — [5] M. Jugie, *ot>. cit.,* 442-447, 448-4;4.

[6] M. Jugie,'/». *O.,* 16, 434*439; *O.,* 19, 297-317.

[7] F. N\U. *Eusèbe d'Alex.,* in *Dici, ihéol.,* 1526-1527. See also the same, *Notes,* in *Rev. Or. chrét.,* 190S (t. XIII), p. 406-434.

[8] *P. G.,* 86, 313-362 (according to Mai). Biography, *ibid.,* 297-310.

[9] Cyril's successors were Dioscurus (444-451) and Proterius (451-457).

III. ASCETICS AND MYSTICS.

I. Diadochus of Photike [1]

Diadochus, Bishop of Photike in Epirus, in chiefly known as the author of a little treatise on spirituality, a masterpiece of its kind. 'I his is the *Centum capita deperfectione spirituali*[2] or *Capita gnostica centum,* according to the Greek text [3]. Apart from this work, only one other of his homilies is extant [4]. Of the man himself we know no more than that he lived in the middle of the fifth century, that he combated the Euchites (condemned at Ephesus in 431) [5], and in 458 signed a letter from the bishop of his province to Leo I, on the occasion of the death of Proterius, who was massacred by the Monophysites in 457. It would not seem that he took an active part in the Christological controversies; he was an ascetic and a contemplative, chiefly taken up with the things of the interior life.

His spiritual opusculum is one of the most valuable we have inherited from the early Church. To all appearances it was composed before Dionysius' writings, but it teaches a very similar mystical doctrine[6,7] It is perhaps less theoretical than the Areopagite's, and while not less profound, is outstanding for its wisdom and discretion, qualities which are easily perceived to be the fruit of experience acquired by a man of thorough commonsense and tried virtue [7].

The first eleven chapters form a kind of general introduction to the treatise. Diadochus bases his spirituality (ch. 1) on faith, hope and especially charity, "which must precede, like a guide, all spiritual contemplation (θεωρία)[8]". This contemplation to which he desires to lead his disciple produces the likeness of God in the soul (ch. 4), gives perfect know edge through a "spiritual sense" (ch. 1, 7), and terminates with words of spiritual exhortation (ch. 7) provided this knowledge is

[1] *P. G.,* 65 *(Marcus Diadochus).* The word, Marcus, found in Migne, is erroneous: this name is found only in the manuscripts of the *Sermo contra ariano: (P. G.,* 65, 1149-1166), which dates from the fourth century.

[2] *G.,* 65, 1167-1212 (Datin trans, by Fr. Torres, S. J., 1570).

[3] Last, edit., Weiss-Leibe«SDORF, *Bibliotheca Teuhneriana,* Leipzig, 1912.

[4] On the Ascension: *P. G.,* 65, 1141-1148»

[5] See Vol. I, p. 303 (note).

[6] Diadochus does not employ the word mystic ; but his whole work deals with mystical realities.

[7] A summary of his teaching will be found in A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 52-62; G. Horn, *Sens de Pesprit d'après Diadoque de Photicé,* in *Rev. Asc. et Mysi.* 1927 (t. vili), p. 402'419.

[8] Πάση πνευματική , αδελφοί, ήγείσθω θεωρία πιστι , ελπί , αγάπη : c. ι.

not the fruit merely of the gift of knowledge or the gnosis (γνώσι), but ot wisdom σοφία (ch. 9)· On the one hand of course " it is a good thing to expect of faith, through the working of charity, the light which enables us to speak of faith ; for nothing is so poor as the intellect, which without (the help of) God, treats of the things of God" (ch. 7). But, on the other hand, not every spiritual light brings with it the gift of speaking of («od (ch. 9), and even that which does so (i. e., wisdom) is often vouchsafed with such force and abundance that it cannot be expressed in speech [1] : only when the light is less brilliant does it permit the mystic to speak of divine things[2]; such is the measure that befits the spoken word; but a greater plenitude of light nourishes faith and thus "he who teaches, first savours through charity the fruits of knowledge γνώσεω " (ch. 8).

What then is this supernatural light to which the author attaches such importance? Diadochus connects it chiefly with charity, and, as one who has experienced it rather than as a philosopher, he describes it as an effect of the spiritual sense, or *sense of the mind**. He distinguishes the latter from the " senses of the body " (αἱ τοὺ σώματο αισθήσει), which have material objects, whilst the former on the contrary is only drawn to "heavenly things" (ch. 24). The author calls it a *taste,* γεῦσι , and this word corresponds perfectly to the Latin word *sapientia:* "The spiritual sense is an unerring taste for things perceived by the mind[4]. Thanks to that power of tasting·, which is one of our bodily senses, we arc able to discern unerringly, when we are in good health, the good from the bad, and we desire what is agreable: similarly our "mind", when it is kept in good health and completely cut off from all disturbance, is able to feel abundantly the divine consolation and is never ravished [5] by any contrary sentiment. Just as the body, when tasting the sweetness of material viands, never fails to find sensible enjoyment, so the mind, when it is granted to it to be (raised) above the prudence of the flesh is able to savour without fail[6] the consolation of the Holy Ghost; for it is said : *O taste and see that the Lord is sweet*

1 Tunc enim anima, charitate Dei velut ebria, expetit per silentium contemplatione gloria.· Domini perfrui (eh. 8).

2 Quamobrem opus est, observata mediocritate illuminationis, ad loquendum de divinis rebus devenire (eh. 8). — See Vol. I, p. 26. *Introduction,* with reference to *perfect contemplative meditation,* what is said regarding the co-existence of contemplation with the activity of the faculties; the latter is only possible "in an *attenuated* brilliance of contemplation " when contemplation is "of an attenuated intensity".

3 He says αἴσθησι νοερά, ch. I, 7; αἴσθησι τοὺ νοὺ, ch. 24, 76, 77, 79; αἴσθησι νοο' , ch. 30» 36; αἴσθησι πνεύματο , ch. 15; αἴσθησι καρδία , ch. 14, 16. 23, 4°> 9l ἴ ~είρα αἴσθήσεω , eh. 11, 23, 24. Cf. Horn, *op. cit.,* p. 404. As this author rightly remarks, Diadochus, who was neither a philosopher nor a philologist, employs the words mind (πνεύμα), understanding (νοὺ), heart and sometimes soul, in the same sense, to signify the nobler part of man, which is at the same time vision and love and the true seat of the " spiritual sense ". All the mystics similarly stress this summit of the mind, the *apex mentis.* See Vol. I, p. 23.

4 Αἴσθησι ἐστι νοὸ γεύσι ακριβή των διακρινομένων.

5 This expression should not be taken too literally.

6 See St . Teresa, *Int. Cast.,* Vth Mans., ch. 1.

(Ps. 33, 9); and (it may) by the exercise of charity obtain unfailingly the memory of this savouring so as to be able to esteem the things that are nobler, according to the words of St. Paul : *And this I pray that your charity may more and more abound in knowledge and in all understanding, that you may approve the better things* (Phil. I, 9-10)" (ch. 30).

By this spiritual sense the Holy Ghost truly forms souls in the likeness of God and brings charity to its full perfection just as an artist gradually builds up his picture with many colours (ch. 89). Diadochus distinguishes three stages in this gradual education of the soul : a period of sweet consolation at the beginning of the spiritual life, followed by a long period of struggle against the onslaughts of the devil, during which the soul is purified and gradually tends to the perfect possession of the spiritual sense which is finally vouchsafed it and which wholly transforms it (ch. 90). In souls thus favoured is often found a very eminent, infused activity of charity that "surpasses faith" *(supra fidem consistere)* for "he who clings to God with a burning love is then far greater than his faith; he wholly possesses that which he desires" (ch. 91)[1]. This desire, which is an act of charity enriched by the spiritual sense, establishes the soul in a higher state than does imperfect, simple faith.

Among the very numerous means which assist the development of the "spiritual sense" in the soul, Diadochus mentions as most important[3]* in addition to the exercise of the three theological virtues : 1. the fight against the passions and the "senses of the body" (ch. 24, 25); 2. the fight against the devil who is ever on the alert to betray us (ch. 31 sq., 76, sq., 96, sq., etc.); 3. obedience (ch. 41) ; 4. continence and temperance (ch. 42 sq.); 5. tranquillity (ch. 61 sq.); 6. poverty and humility (ch. 65, 94 sq.); 7. silence, recollection, and spiritual trials (ch. 69, 71); 8. prayer (ch. 70 sq.). Diadochus gives very wise counsel on all these virtues, always bearing in mind the need of leading his disciple to perfect charily by submission to the Holy Ghost, Who is the source of the "spiritual sense" in man.

One of the *effects* of charity as perfected by the spiritual sense, and therefore also one of the characters of perfection, is " theology " or rather the *knowledge of God,* which has a close connection with the charismata and the gifts of wisdom and intelligence (ch. 9 and 72) as well as with the

[1] Spiritualem vero charitatem nemo comparare potest nisi a Spiritu Sancto plenissime illuminetur. Nisi enim mens similitudinem Dei per divinum lumen perfecte recipiat, ceteras fere virtutes habere quidem potest, perfecta vero charilatis adhuc expers remanet.

[3] Μείζων ἐστί πολύ τότε τή εαυτού πιστεω , ὠ όλο ὠν εν πόΟφ. This should be taken as meaning a relative superiority, as is shown by the word πόθο , desire, which is here employed; for it implies an incomplete understanding, and the entire context leaches that the three theological virtues remain in this life. See also ch. 1. For this distinction between imperfect and perfect faith see Vol. 1, p. 1S5, 20.

[3] Diadochus protests forcefully against the *Euchite* teaching (see λ7ο1. I, p. 303), which explains temptation by a cohabitation of God and the devil in the soul.

gift of speaking of spiritual things (ch. 8). It is enthusiastically described in chapter 67: " All the gifts of God are good; they are the source of all good; but none of them so inflames us and so urges our hearts to the love of His goodness as does theology. Since it is a premature fruit of divine grace, it showers on the soul its first gifts; first, it makes us despise without regrets friendships of this lite by offering us, in the place of perishable joys, the unutterable wealth of the words of God; but then it goes on to enlighten our minds with a transforming fire which makes it share with the " ministering" spirits. Thus, my very dear brethren, let us, who are well prepared, aspire to this virtue which is so beautiful, which contemplates all (την πανθεωρον), which is empty of all wordly care, which is filled with the mysterious brilliance of light and nourishes the soul with the words of God: in a word, by the holy prophets (the Holy Books that it studies) it unites the reasoning soul to God the Word with an indissoluble bond and, O wonder of wonders, this heavenly friend of the Spouse harmonises a divine melody among men that the power of God may be ever sung". This "theology" which does such great things is neither simple study nor pure contemplation, but a prayer, or rather, a *meditation* which when penetrated by the " spiritual sense " becomes *contemplative.*

2. Apophthegmata, Spiritual Letters.

In his work Diadochus drew largely on the Cappadocian Fathers, and especially Saint Gregory of Nazianzus; but he also made great use of other sources, chiefly monastic spirituality. The latter is to be found in a shortened form, but fully and simply expressed, in one of those historical and doctrinal collections known by the generic name of *Apophthegmata* or *Sentences* [*]. Unfortunately this literature is still in a state of vast and inaccessible disorder. Besides the texts to be found in the Greek Patrology there exist a very great number of others in Greek, Arab and Copt. Some have been published by Nau, Arnelinean and Crum, but for the most part they remain buried in the manuscripts of the monasteries of Mount Athos, Syria and Egypt. Until a complete study[1] of these documents has been carried out it is impossible to drawn any definite conclusion as to their worth and origin, and still less as regards the abridgements and partial collections that have been published. The most famous of these collections, the

[1] See Vol. i, p. 500.

[*] On Coptic literature see W. E. CRUM, *Theological texts from Coptic papyri,* Oxford. 1913 (Appendix). W. BOUSSET, *Apophthegmata,* Tübingen, 1923 (thè sources for the most part are ignored'. Cf. *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1925, p. 101-105.

Apophthegmata Patrum (Ἀποφθέγματα των αγίων γερόντων) would seem to date from the sixth century

Of greater importance from many points of view is the vast collection oí letters of spiritual direction (about 850) left by the monk, Saint Barsa NUPHIUS a, a native of Egypt, who lived as a solitary in a monastery at (.aza, where he was master of Saint Dorotheus. He probably died about the year 5402 Over a long period he had intercourse with the outside world only by means of letters or short notes in answer to various questions which were put to him. Hence the title ot ερωταποκρίσει . Thus the actual text contains both the *question* and the *answer.* The contents of this precious correspondance makes it desirable that there should be a more perfect edition than that published by the Athonite monk, Nicodemus4.*

IV. HISTORIANS AND CHRONICLERS.

I. In the forefront of the historians of this period must be mentioned Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret 5, who *continued the work of Eusebius.*

Theodoret's *Ecclesiastical History* has already been mentioned 6. It remains to us to speak of his two immediate predecessors, who were not churchmen and bishops but laymen and lawyers.

Socrates, born at Constantinople about 408, was a lawyer in that town. 1 le wrote an *Ecclesiastical History* 7 in 7 books, covering the period between 323 and 439. This work was probably terminated about 440-443. The author's intention was to continue the work that Eusebius had undertaken, and although he is in no wise the latter's equal as regards his literary quality8 he surpasses him as a rule both in sincerity and impartiality. lie has, however, been rightly reproached with marked Novatian leanings. He possessed the two essential qualities of a historian: a critical sense in the use

1 S. Vailhé, *Les Apophthegmata Patrum,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1901 (t. v), p. 39-46. Cotelier's edit., in *P. G.,* 65, 71-440.

2 S. Vailhé, 5. *Barsannphe,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1905 (t. vm), p. 14-25. On his disciple and collaborator, *St. John the Prophet,* see *ibii.,* p. 154-160. See below p. 287.

' According to Evagrius' account. *IList. Eccl.,* IV, c. 33. Cf. *ibid.,* p. 16-17.

4 For this edition, see S. Vailhé, *ibid.,* 1904 (t. vn), p. 268-276.

s Two other histories of which hardly anything remains, are known:

λ) The *Christian History* of Philip of Side, a priest of Pamphylia and contemporary of Socrates. This is a voluminous work in 36 books, but written without chronology and without judgment; only fragments are extant.

¿1 The *Ecclesiastical History* of Hesychius of Jerusalem, of which a chapter is extant (see above, p. 102).

6 See above, p. 43· — 7 *P. G.,* 67, 29-842 (edit, and notes by Valois).

8 According to Photius his style lacks elegance. *Bibl.,* cod. 28.

of sources and a historical instinct for grasping the chain of cause and effect which underlie a mass of events.

Sozomen, also a lawyer at Constantinople, but a native of Palestine, wrote an *Ecclesiastical History* [1] in 9 books about the same period. This as a whole is no more than a recast of Socrates' work, although the author has often made a better and more comprehensive use of his predecessor's sources. His work nevertheless has less value than Socrates'. It covers only a century from 323 to 423. The last book was finished in 443 or 444 [2].

2. To these three authors may be added three others whose work has a certain interest from various points of view.

At the beginning of the sixth century Theodorus Lector[3], so called on account of the office he filled at Saint Sophia of Constantinople, wrote a *Tripartite History.* This work is a compilation in four books of the works of the three preceding authors. The second part, however, also in four books, continued their labours to the year 527 (when Justinian became Emperor). This latter part is lost except for fragments[4], while only two books of the first part remain [5].

G-elasius of Cyzicus, a Bithynian priest, wrote, about the year 475-476, a " History of the Council of Nicea"[6], which is in reality a history, in three books, of the Church under Constantine the Great. In addition to the three historians already mentioned the author makes use of various documents whose authenticity has not yet been sufficiently established[7].

Zacharius Rhetor, Bishop of Mitylene about 536 and a leading Monophysite, wrote, after 491 while he was still a layman, an *Ecclesiastical History* [8]9covering the years 430-491. This work, written from a Monophysite viewpoint, is useful for the study of the Christological controversies [9]. Zacharias is also the author of a dialogue " on the

[1] *P. G.,* 67, S43-1630 (edit, and notes by Valois).

[2] Socrates and Sozomen are both in their way witnesses to the Greek Christian recognition of the pontifical primacy. This witness is all the more remarkable inasmuch as Socrates had little personal sympathy for Rome. See the interesting note by Mgr Batiffol in Zz *Siège Apostolique,* appendix to ch. VI, *Excursus B.,* p. 411-416.

[3] J. BIDEZ, *La tradition manuscrite de Sozomène el la Tripartite de Theodore le Lecteur,* Leipzig, 1908. — [4] *P. G.,* 86 (1), 165-216.

[5] In manuscripts. — [6] *P. G.,* 85, 1191-1360.

[7] He had recourse to a *History of the Church* written by a certain priest, John, and which is regarded by many as a myth.

[8] Preserved only in Syriac, in a *General History* in 12 books of which it forms book in-vi. Brooks' edit., in *Corpus* of Vienna. Cf. K. Ahrens and G. Krueger, *Die S. Kircheng. des Zach. Rh.,* Teubner, 1899; see F. Delmas on Zacharias in *Echos d'Orient,* 1S99 (11e), p. 36-40.

[9] The one historian to give us really valuable information on these controversies *Scholasticus:* see p. 281. Another Monophysite bishop John Rufus of Majuma, ako wrote a number of *Plerophories* in the form of a history: but this consists of no more than a series of visions, predictions and wonders directed against the Councu of Chalcedon (See A *O.,* 8; F. Nau's edit.)

creation of the world" against the neo-Platonistsa refutation of Manichaeism', and a number of *biographies,* notably the life of Severus of Antioch[2] and of the monk, Isaías[4][5] Other lives are no longer extant.

3. *Hagiography* became more and more popular after the fifth century. The most outstanding author in this literary field was Cyril of Scythopolis[5]. Born in Palestine at Scythopolis about 523, a coenobite at Saint Euthymius in 544, he withdrew to the New Laura in 554, and later, in 557, to the Great Laura of St. Sabbas, where he died shortly afterwards. The many *Lives* he composed are regarded as the most trustworthy hagiographical writings of the early Church; they consist of historical biographies rather than panegyrics. In spite of the taste for marvels and prodigies that he possessed in common with his contemporaries, he was careful to consult reliable sources of information. His best *Lives* were those of *Saint Euthymius the Great*[6][7] (d. 473) and *Saint Sabbas*[7] (d. 532), both written in 556. The five others[8][9][10] are shorter, but none the less valuable.

Many *anonymous* Lives, dating from this period, and especially the following, are still extant. We can do no more than mention them here[9].

The Chronicle, which is always found in great profusion during periods of feeble literary culture, is represented by the following authors.

Hesychius of Miletus (d. about 550) composed a *Universal History*™ extending to the year 518; the remainder, on the life of Justinus and the beginning of Justinian's reign, is lost, as is also a collection of biographies of which only fragments quoted by Suidas and Photius remain.

Eustathius of Epiphania, in Syria, wrote a chronicle (not extant) which was utilised by Theodorus Lector; it was carried as far as the year 502.

1 *G.,* 85, ion-1144.
2 Lost except for a fragment, *P. G.,* 85, 1143-1144.
3 *O.,* 2 (Kungener's edit.), 1907.
4 *Corpus* of Vienna, 1907, t. xxv (Brooks' edit.).
5 See R. Génler, *Vie de S. Euthyme le Gr.,* Paris, 1909.
6 Monteaucon's edit., *Analecta grcrca,* 168S, p. 1-99.
7 Cotelier's edit., *Eccl. gr. Monmn.,* in, 220-376.
6 St. John the Silent, d. 558 *(Acta S. S.* May, ill); S. Cyriacus, d. 556 *(Acta S.* 5., September, Vili); S. Theognius, d. 522 *(Anal. Boll.,* 1891); St. Abramius *(ibid.,* 1905); S. Theodosius, d. 529 (Usener's edit., Leipzig, 1890).
9 See a list of these Byzantine *Lives in* J. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* p. XViii-χχ.
10 J. C. Orblli's edit., Leipzig, 1820. Muller *(frag. hist, gr.f* Paris, 1841-1870, t. V, p. 143-177-

The following also deserve mention: the Chronicle of Edessa written about 540, and the Chronicle of Arbella a chronological collection of biographies written shortly after 550.

The Chronicle wrongly attributed to Josué the Stylite is a history of Eastern Syria for the years 495-509. It is found in the und part of the *History* of John of Asia (see p. 70); but whether it is anterior or posterior to the latter [2] is unknown. This lind part of the History of John of Asia is preserved only in the Chronicle of Tell-Mahre, a compilation which is not the work of Dionysius of Tell-Mahre (ixth cent.) as Assémani thought, but of a monk who wrote about 775 and who was perhaps called *Josué the Stylite*.

The Synodicon adversus tragoediam Irenæi[4], an anonymous Latin work written in the sixth century by a protagonist of the Three Chapters. This was possibly the deacon Rusticus. The author makes use of the *Tragadla* which Count Irenæus, the defender of Nestorius at the Council of 431, had written before he became Bishop of Tyre about 445. But whereas in the latter work Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret and Ibas are shown as being Nestorius' partisans against the " heterodox Cyril"; in the Synodicon, on the contrary, these four individuals are portrayed as defending orthodoxy against Nestorius. The anonymous Latin writer made an extremely free adaptation. His translation also is very poor and often erroneous, and his style is vile. The documents quoted nevertheless retain some real value.

CHAPTER X.

Early Armenian Literature.

Special Bibliography (on the chapter as a whole)[5].

P. Neumann, *Versucheiner Geschichte der arm. Litteratur,* Leipzig, 1836; *Beitrcege sur arm. Litteratur,* Munich, 1849. J· N1RSCHL, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie,* in, p. 215-262. L. Petit, *Arménie,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1888-1968. Fr. TOURNEBIZE, *Histoire politique et religieuse de PArménie,* Paris, 1910; *Arménie,* in *Diet. Hist.,* col. 290-391. V. LANGLOIS, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie,* 2 vol., Paris, 1867-1869.

1 Assemanfs edit., *Bibl. Orient.,* I, 388-417. See also *Corp. Or.,* in. L. Halilier, in *Texte u. Unters.,* IX, I, Leipzig, 1892.

2 MiNGANA's edit., *Sources syriaques,* I, 1907.

3 So that it is either the source or a derivative of John of Asia's *History.*

2 *P. G.,* 84, 551-864. See *Biblioi/uca Cassia.,* I (1873), 49 84; *Florilegium Can.,* 5-56. Cf. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte,* iv, p. 252-254.

s For the various authors, see the notes.

I. THE FOUNDERS OF ARMENIAN LITERATURE.

The finest works of early Armenian literature were also the first to be composed in that tongue. They were written in the fifth century by the very men who invented the Armenian Alphabet, Sahak THE Great (Isaac of Armenia) and MESROB.

Armenia had been converted to Christianity for more than a century through the efforts of Gregory the Illuminator (d. about 332;. Gregory was the son of a satrap who, having been exiled in Cappadocia, became a Christian, and returning to Armenia won over the king, Tiridates in (261-317), to the Christian faith about 280. Although he was already married, Gregory on the king's instance obtained episcopal consecration from the Bishop of Cæsarea and established a hierarchy of twelve or fifteen bishops. He, his sons and his grandsons after him, fulfilled the office of catholicos or patriarch under the high jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Cæsarea*. This new-founded Christian community employed Greek and Syriac as its liturgical tongue according to the region, and though the language of the country was used for the instruction of the faithful it was preserved in no written document. The *sermons* attributed to Saint Gregory are in reality Mesrob's \ Aristakes (325'333), the youngest son and first successor of Saint Gregory, assisted at the Council of Nicea. It has been supposed that Gregory, on his son's return, himself added to the Creed the passages concerning the eternity, the immutability and the consubstantiality of the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father. This addition, however, would seem to derive from the Athanasian Creed, which was introduced into Armenia in the sixth century[3].

Among Saint Gregory's successors in the fourth century the most famous was his grandson, Nerses the Great, who during his short episcopate (364-373) accomplished a great deal of organisation and reform. He increased the numbers of schools for teaching Greek and Syriac, as well as monasteries for men and women. About 365 he held the first great national synod of Ashtishat when the Armenian Church was reorganised and modelled on that of Cæsarea : the canons of the Council, composed by Nerses, are no longer extant[4]. Believing firmly in the need of a better understanding with the West, Nerses subscribed in 372 to the synodal letter addressed by Saint Basil to the Italian bishops with a view to the re-establishment of unity[5]. The political situation of his country, however, was destined to set his Church on a course which took it ever farther from Rome.

1 Only «after Sahak in was the episcopate reserved to celibate priests.

2 See below, p. 116.

3 See J. CATEKGIAN, *De fidei symbolo quo armenii utuntur observationes,* Vienna, 1893. Cf. L. Petit, *op. cit.,* col. 1947.

4 Those edited by Mai *(Scriptorum veterum nova collectio,* Rome, X, 1S3S, p. 312 sq.), do not appear to be authentic.

5 *Epist.* 60. See Vol. I, p. 410.

CHAPTER X.

Sahak III, the Great[x], Armenian Patriarch from about 390 to 440, in order to preserve the independence of his people, was led to make an important decision. Armenia, placed on the frontiers of the Roman (Greek) and Persian Empires, had long been a bone of contention, and at the end of the fourth century came almost wholly under Persian domination. Since the Persians had forbidden the use of Greek, and were endeavouring to impose Syriac as the liturgical tongue, the Patriarch conceived the idea of restoring and perfecting the national alphabet which had fallen into disuse. By this means he hoped to give new life to the Armenian language. He was admirably seconded in his labours by Mesrob, who was the true author of this adaptation. Thus it was that the literary language of the time, the *krapar,* became the definite liturgical tongue of the Armenian people. To Sahak is due the *translation of the Bible,* which was carried out under his guidance. He himself formulated, in addition to a number of *hymns* and three extant *letters*[2], an important body of disciplinary and liturgical laws, which, it is said, was promulgated at the Council of Valarshapat (426)[3]. Sahak was unable to assist at the Council of Ephesus (431), but when the Nestorians later attempted to spread their teaching in Armenia he consulted Proelus, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who informed him of the decisions taken by the Council. These he adopted at the Synod of Ashtishat (435), where he proclaimed Christ to be the Son of God, and Mary the Mother of God[4]. On the other hand, Sahak had succeeded in obtaining from Constantinople full spiritual authority over Greek Armenia, which until then had been attached to Cæsarea, while by sending young men of culture into the monasteries of Constantinople he kept in touch with the intellectual life of the Empire and the Western Church[5]. He died about 440 and was at once venerated.

Mesrob, also called Mashtots[6] is chiefly known for his invention of the Armenian alphabet. He did not, as was for a long time thought, compose a wholly original alphabet.

[x] He was the son of the Patriarch, Nerses. The law of celibacy for bishops was brought in about this time.

[2] In the *Hist. d'Arminie* (in, 57) by Moses of Chorene

[3] Cf. L. Petit, *op. cit.,* col. 1926.

[4] Fr. Tournebize, *Arménie,* col. 300-301.

[6] See J. Karst, *Mesrob,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 789-792.

There existed, even perhaps before the Christian era, an Armenian alphabet, used by the Pagan writers. With the introduction of Greek and Syriac as liturgical languages, however, it gradually fell into disuse. It was still known to some scholars, such as the Bishop Daniel; but since it contained only consonants and no vowels it was of little practical use [1]. It was so cleverly revised by Mesrob that it became an instrument perfectly adapted for the expression of the complexities of the Armenian language, and the decadent Armenian literature took on a new and splendid lease of life [2].

Mesrob was a genius in every sphere and was widely read in Persian, Greek and Syriac literature. A disciple of Nerses, he became a priest after having been Chancellor to the King of Armenia; he evangelised a region infested with Mazdeism, and eventually, about 406, placed himself at the disposition of the Catholicos, Sahak, who had been attracted by his talents. He collaborated with Sahak until his death, and would have succeeded him had he not died himself six months later (441) after having administered the vacant see for six months.

While still continuing his apostolic labours, Mesrob also directed a *School* or *Academy of Translators.* The most important translation made by this School was that of *the Bible*[3]* in 410, from the *Peshitto;* in 432 this was revised on the Greek text (Septuagint and New Test.). Mesrob himself translated the New Testament. He also composed a collection of *homilies* entitled "Sermons of St. Gregory the Illuminator a *Eucholoyion* or Prayer Book; and a number of *hymns.* It is possible that the *ritual* which bears his name, i. e., *Mashtots*[5], as far as its essentials and primitive content are concerned, dates from this period and is the work of Sahak-Mesrob. Several critics, however, attribute its composition to a certain Mashtots, living in the ninth century.

II. DISCIPLES AND SUCCESSORS OF MESROB.

Armenian literature subsisted for a long time by borrowing from the writings of other peoples, and those who

[1] Proto-Armenian writing was a variant of Aramæo-pahlavi. It is generally thought that the Paleo-Armenian language was similar to Hittite hieroglyphs.

[2] At the same time Mesrob adapted the same early Aramæo-pahlavi writing to the Ibero-Georgian language in Iberia (Georgia).

[3] II. Hivernât, *Arménienne,* (Version), in *Diet. Bibl.,* col. 1010-1015.

[*] *Edit.,* Constantinople, 1737; Venice, 1838.

[5] See F. C. Conybeare, *Rituale Armeniorum,* Oxford, 1905. Cf. *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1906 (t. vu), p. 618-624 (Fr. de Puniet). See also L. Petit, *op. cit.,* col. 1966.

continued Mesrob's work were chiefly translators. He had, however, disciples who produced original work. The best known of these is Eznik.

Eznik, before he became Bishop of Bagrevand, had perfected himself in translating Syriac texts into Armenian at Edessa, and Greek texts at Constantinople, where he lived from 426 to 432 and from whence he brought the text of the Acts of Ephesus and the Greek text of the Bible (used in the revision of the Armenian Bible). He is especially famous for his treatise "*Against the Sects*" \ a refutation of Paganism in general; first the dualist error (book 1), Parseeism or Mazdeism (book II) and Greek Philosophy (book in), and lastly Marcionite Gnosticism (book iv). This work, skilfully composed, well thought out and written in a pure and elegant style, is considered one of the masterpieces of Armenian literature 2.

Goriun, a bishop of Georgia, composed an enthusiastic biography of his master, Mesrob, written in classical style. This is the chief source of information for Mesrob's life. It was written about 445-451 3.

John Mandakuni (died about 498), Catholicos, fifth successor to Sahak, left a number of sermons 4 and especially liturgical prayers, as well as a penitential canon which is preserved in the Armenian ritual attributed to Mesrob5. As for the translators, the best known are: *Chosrov, Ananias,* and *David the Armenian,* who busied themselves especially with philosophical works (Plato and Aristotle.

Among the works translated into Armenian6, in addition to the Bible, may be mentioned :

a *History* of Armenia by Faustus Byzantinus 7;
two of Philo's *opuscula* (On Providence; On Animals);
Eusebius' *Chronicle;*
Aristide's *Apology;*
fifteen of Severian of Gabala's *homilies;*
several of St. Ephræm's *treatises* and homilies ;
St. Basil's *Hexaemeron;*
various *commentaries* of St. John Chrysostom.

This list is far from being complete. Many other works may still lie hidden in manuscripts.

* Edited at Smyrna, 1761 ; Venice, 1850.

3 A collection of 93 maxims attributed to Eznik would appear to be a translation of a Greek collection composed by Saint Nilus.

3 Complete edition of the earliest recension, Venice, 1833. Abridged version translated by V. Langlois, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 9-16.

4 German trans, by J. M. Schmid, Regensburg, 1871.

5 Cf. Conybeare, *Rituale Arm,,* p. 294-295.

6 See L. Petit, *op. cit.,* col. 1935-1937.

* See below.

HI. ARMENIAN HISTORIANS.

"Agathangelus" [1] was the name taken by the author of a famous history of Christian origins in Armenia, bearing the title: *History of King Terdat, of Grigor Loussavoritch* (the Illuminator) *and the Conversion of the Armenians* [2]. The work contains not only an account of historical happenings, but also doctrinal explanations in the form of homilies, purporting to be due to Gregory. The unknown author (Agathangelus appears to be merely symbolical) claims to to be a contemporary of Tiridates III and Gregory, but little belief can be given to this statement. He could not have written before the middle of the fifth century (about 450); no doubt he made use of earlier writings [3] but he adds to them legendary detail (such as Tiridates' metamorphosis into a wild boar, ch. 20 or n. 89). This history was translated into Greek at an early date (without Gregory s sermons)·[4] and also into Arabics.

Agathangelus' History was continued by that of Faustus Byzantinus [5]. Written originally in Greek, but extant only in Armenian, this is "the best source for the history of Armenia from the year 330 to 387, in spile of a number of legendary accounts and a certain partiality for the Mamikonian family" [7].

Lazarus of Pharp, also called the Rhetor[8], composed a *History* of Armenia from 388 to 438, which is one of the best for the period. I he author, who lived during the second part of this period, is well informed and trustworthy, in spite of a very obvious bias in favour of the liberator of Armenia.

Elishe the Doctor, who for a long period was thought to be the same as a fifth century bishop of the same name but who, it appears, probably lived in the sixth century (he made use of Lazarus' History), is chiefly remembered for his *History of Vahan* (Mamikonian) *and the Armenian War*[9], an account of the heroic Armenian resistance to the Persians in 449-451. Othei works attributed to him are: commentaries (Josué, Judges, the *Pater}*, divers homilies, canons (on the manner of treating diabolical possession). A fine epistle to the Armenian monk< is certainly authentic.

[1] See 1·. Pournebize, *Agathange,* in *Dtd. Hist.,* col. 906-907; *Hist, relit*. et pol. de I|Arménie,* p. 426-464, and passim.

[2] Edited at Constantinople, 1709, and later at Venice, 1835 and 1862.

[3] Possibly a Life of St. Gregory and a History of his martyrdom.

[4] Greek text and Latin trans, in *Acta Sand.,* 1762, September, vin, p. 320-402.

[5] Edited by N. Marr, in *Zapiski* (St. Petersburg), 1905 (t, xvi), p. 66, 148.

[6] Edit., Venice, 1889. Fr. trans, in Langlois, *op. cit.,* 1, 209-310.

[7] F. Tounebize, *Arménie,* col. 292.

[8] Edit., Venice, 1889. Fr. trans., Langlois, *op. cit.,* 11, 253-368.

[9] Edit. Venice. Fr. Langlois, *trans., op. cit.,* 11, 183-251.

Moses of Chorene in the best known and the most mysterious of Armenian historians. Three writings, all written certainly by the same author, are extant under his name : a *History of Armenia Major*[1], *a Geography* (extracted or imitated from a similar work by the Alexandrian, Pappus), and a *Treatise on Rhetoric,* entitled "Chria" and modelled on Greek works. The History, which is by far the most important, contains three books: *book I* covers the period from the beginning of the world to 149 B. C., the date of the foundation of the Arsacide dynasty; *book II,* from 149 B. C. to the death of St. Gregory, about 332 ; *book III,* from 332 to 428, the date of the fall of the Arsacides. Another book which carries the history as far as the time of Zeno (474-491) is lost. The author pretends to be *Moses of Chorene,* a disciple of Mesrob, who was very popular in the fifth century, became Bishop of Bagrevand and died, it is said, in 487, at the age of 120. Although there is no doubt that this person really lived in the fifth century, it is less certain that he was the author of the works mentioned. The chief purpose of the History was to glorify the Bagratunid dynasty, which is scarcely heard of before the seventh century; in addition, many sixth and seventh century sources are used. The critics consider that together with the two other writings it was composed in the eighth century by an unknown author who assumed the name of Moses of Cherene. He made use of a number of early documents, notably popular legends and folksongs, which lent special charm and value to the work [2]3

We will make no attempt to follow the development of Armenian literature after the sixth century. At this period the Armenian Church was involved in the opposition to Chalcedon, and also apparently in Monophysitism [3]. In the time of the Henoticon, Constantinople induced the Armenians to believe that Chalcedon was heretical, while even the most moderate Syrian Monophysites declared that

1 Edit., Venice, 1843, 1865. Fr. trans, in Langlois, *op. cit.,* n, 45-175. See various studies on M. of Ch. by A. Carrière (published at Paris, 1891, 1895, 1899, or at Vienna, 1893, 1894). These are talented and scholarly critical studies.

2 The *History oj Taron* by a certain Zenob of Glak, who claims to be a disciple of St. Gregory, but who in reality wrote in the eighth century, is much less valuable and consists merely of a tissue of legends, says Tournebize (col. 292).

3 See F. Tournebize, *Armtnie,* col. 302-305. L. Petit, *op. cit.,* coi. 1296-1899.

it was opposed to the Council of Ephesus (431). The Armenians who had accepted the latter, were thus led to protest in several synods and notably at Tvin (552)[1] against the decrees of Chalcedon. In adopting this attitude they were persuaded that they were remaining faithful to the traditional and Catholic faith of the Empire. Later, it is true, various patriarchs accepted Dyophysitism, the teaching of Chalcedon, but these were exceptions. The Armenian Church asa whole cut itself off in practice from the Catholic Church, even in matters of faith; the causes of this rupture must be sought either in the ambiguity of current theological formulas[2], or in the political conditions in which the nationa' life developed.

[1] At this synod of I vin the calendar was reformed.

[2] The terms *nature, person, physical* or *hypostatic union* were imperfectly understood and the text of St. Leo's letter to Flavian was poorly rendered.

SECOND SECTION

CHAPTER XI.

Saint Leo the Great.

Special Bibliography.

Edition: *P. L.,* 54-56 (P. and H. B.ALLERlNl's edition, 1755-1757; an excellent revised edit, of QuESNEL'S 1675 edition which was put on the Index).

Studies: TlLLEMONT, *Mémoires,* t. XV (1711), p. 414-832. — A. de Saint-Chiron, *Hist, du pontificat de S. Léon le Grand,* Paris, 1845. — A. REGNIER, 5. *Léon le Grand* (Coll. *Les Saints),* Paris, 1910. — P. Batiffol, *Léon Pr (saint)* in *Diet, théol.,* 218-301 ; *Le Siège Apostolique,* Paris, 1924, p. 417-618. — Special monographs (in German) on Leo's Christology, by P. KUHN, Wurtzburg, 1894; on preaching, by J. PSCHMADT, Elberfeld, 1912; on religious policy, by \V. KlSSLlNG, Paderborn, 1921 ; (in Italian), on St. Leo and the East, by A. G. AMELLI, Rome, 1882.

I. WORKS AND CHARACTER OF SAINT LEO.

Saint Leo the Great is rightly considered as being the greatest pope of Christian Antiquity, surpassed not even by Saint Gregory. The part he played was of the utmost importance. At an epoch when the whole body" politic in the West was falling in ruins, while religion in the East was enfeebled by the Christological controversies, he was found capable of affirming, realising, and maintaining *Christian unity* under the supreme authority of the successor of St. Peter. He was both the *doctor* and the *defender* of this dogma of the unity of the Church. Such indeed seems to have been his providential mission Before seeing how it was fulfilled, it would not be useless to consider what manner of man he was; a study of his character will help us to understand his work.

I

Saint Leo had attained the age of forty' or fifty[1] years when he ascended the pontifical throne in 440. ile came to Rome[1] while still young. Even as a simple deacon he

[*] He was a Tuscan *(natione 'luscus)* according to the *Liber Pontificalis* (Duchesne's edit., I, 238). The fact that he calls Rome his Fatherland (Ep. 31,4) is not to be taken literally.

became widely known for his literary culture and his strong faith—of which we have ample proof in his energetic onslaught on Pelagianism. It is possible that he was that acolyte who took a letter from Sixtus, the future pope, to Aurelius of Carthage in 418 L When, about 432, Celestine I wrote to the bishops of Gaul to defend the authority of St.Augustine who had been denounced to Rome by two monks of Provence, St. Leo, then a deacon, already wielded considerable influence, and it is supposed with great likelihood that he was the author of the collection of quotations now attached to this Epistle 2 in the form of an appendix. According to St. Prosper3 he also persuaded Pope Sixtus II, in 439, to refuse communion with the Church to Julian of Eclanum who was intriguing to this end at Rome. This move helped to consolidate peace in the Church. A friend of Saint Prosper of Aquitania and of Cassian, he asked the latter, about 430, to compose a refutation of Nestorianism *{De Incarnatione Domini}* 4; in the preface of this work Cassian already calls him "the ornament of the Roman Church and the divine ministry"5. Leo was elected pope in 440 while he was in Gaul engaged in bringing about a reconciliation between the two generals, Aetius and Albinus. He was destined to occupy the see of Peter for 21 years.

Saint Leo's written work, comprising *sermons* and *letters,* is the best source of information as regards both his pontificate and his character.

There are extant 96 authentic sermons6, all elating, with the exception of semi. 84, 91, 96, from the first years of his pontificate. The first five *!De natali i/tsius)* deal with his election (serin. I), or else commemorate its anniversary (serm. 2-5). Sermons 6-11 *(De collectis* or appeals for alms) exalt the practice of almsgiving and good works. The remainder with a few exceptions have been classified by the editors according to the present liturgical order.

' According to letter 191, 1 (from St. Augustine).

2 *Auctoritates de gratia Dei.* See below p. 134. This attribution, first made by Quesnel, is considered very possible by Mgr. Batiffol.

J *Chronic.,* year 439. £., 51, 598. — 4 See vol. 1. p. 595.

5 "Thou hast overcome my resolve to remain silent, and thou hast overcome it by thy praiseworthy zeal ami irresistible desire, *mi Leo, veneranda et suscipienda (atitas mea, romance Ecclesia ac divini ministerii decus".* Mgr. Batiffol adds: "Here, the word *ministerium* may signify deacon's orders, and thus allude to the place occupied by Leo among the seven Roman deacons". *Dtct. théol.,* col. 219. Cassian speaks of Leo's friendly intervention as an order *(iussio; tubes).*

6 *P. L.,* 54, 141-468. Twenty others *(Ibid.,* 477-522) since the Ballerinis are considered apocryphal, as well as the eight published by Caillau (see *P. L.,* 56, 1131-1154).

There arc many sermons on the fast-days; four series correspond with the Ember days; the Lenten fasts lasting forty days; that of Pentecost (Wednesday, Friday and Saturday of one week); the fasts of September and December (only the Wednesday and Friday of one week). I'he first scries (12-20) of these discourses corresponds to the December Ember days, which were later to become a part of Advent; the others are those of Lent (39-50), Pentecost (78-81) and, lastly, September (86-94).

The majority of Saint Leo's other sermons are devoted to the mysteries of Our Lord on the occasion of the appropriate feasts: Christmas (21-30), Epiphany (31-38), Passion' (52-70), Easter (71-72), Ascension (73'74λ Whitsuntide (75-77). To these may be added sermon 51 on the Transfiguration, and 96 on the two natures of the Saviour (against Eutyches).

Five other sermons must be mentioned: two especially famous ones are devoted to the feast of *Sainis Peter and Paul* (82-83) with which may be classed sermon 84, on the neglect of the feast which, after the departure of Genserie and his hordes in June 455, had been established as a day of thanksgiving. Sermon 85 has lor subject the martyrdom of St. Laurence while sermon 95 explains the Beatitudes.

Although Leo's sermons are generally very short, they have always been regarded as models of classical eloquence. They are simple and grave, noble and touching, fatherly and strong. " His sermons " says Mgr. Batiffol " were not taken down by *notarii,* but were written out by his own hand, either after or before he preached them. He was the sole author of his sermons, but few orators have ever been less scrupulous about repeating themselves or contenting themselves with elementary truths and commonplaces. He did not comment the books of the Scriptures for he was no exegete; his sermons fall naturally into the liturgical cycle. Their beauty derives from their tone; with Leo all is clothed in dignity, solemnity, and that Roman emphasis which is so apparent in all the texts of the liturgy. His phrase is ruled by a *cursus;* it is rarely terminated without an antithesis or even assonance 2... Leo truly belongs to his time by these conceits of a declining literature; but he sacrifices to them nothing of the brilliant clarity of his ideas; he speaks only that he may inculcate doctrinal or pastoral truths 3".

All these sermons (except 60, 61, 66, 69, 70), are grouped in pairs, the first being preached on Palm Sunday and the second on the Wednesday of Passion Week in each year.

9 The author quoted gives this example from sermon 32, c. 4 :

quem magi infantem | venerati sunt in cunabulis ‖
nos omnipotentem | adoremur in cœlis ‖

3 *Did. thiol., art. cit.,* col. 279-2S0

Saint Leo loved to preach on Christ's Life, Passion and work of Redemption, and excelled in his bold and simple treatment of these mysteries which he approached as a true pastor rather than as a speculative theologian. He was above all a *moralist*[1] as is evident not only from the general subjects already mentioned, but also in many of his pages, notably those which concern the examination of conscience[2], the devil who is the enemy of salvation[3], concupiscence[4], prayer[5], faith and charity, the two wings which bear us nearer to God[6], and spiritual childhood[7]. Faithful to St. Augustine's teaching on grace, St. Leo insists no less on freewill and moral effort[8], as was to be expected from such a man of action.

Saint Leo's correspondence[9] comprises 173 letters, of which 143 were written by the pope himself[10]. All are official in character, and some are of considerable importance, especially those dealing with the religious situation in the East. The majority rise above the particular events which occasioned them and are rich in precious information, chiefly as regards *dogma*[11] and *discipline*[12]. These carefully studied letters (St. Leo was as meticulous in his correspondence as he was in his preaching), written with great care[13], reveal in no small measure the character of the great pope.

[1] *Senn.* 41, 1.

[2] *Senn.* 9, 1-2; 39, 3-4; 40, 2-3; 41, 2; 42, 3; 48, 2; 49, 3; 57, 5; 58, 4; 90, 1.

[3] *Senn.* 90, 1. — [4] *Semi.* 12, 4; 15, 1.

[5] Et sine fide non diligitur, et sine dilectione non creditur... Hic est quidem efficacissimus geminarum alarum volatus, quo ad promerendum et videndum Deum puritas mentis attollitur, ne onere curarum carnalium deprimatur. *Semi.* 42, 2.

[6] In this page on spiritual childhood should be noted the deliberate harmony of the assonances; but no less is to be admired the spontaneity of this doctrine from the lips of the most solemn of pontiffs: "Amat Christus infantiam, humilitatis magistram, innocentini regulam, mansuetudinis formam. Amat Christus infantiam, ad quam majorum dirigit mores, ad quam senum reducit ætates, et eos ad suum inclinat exemplum quos ad regnum sublimat aeternum", *Semi.* 37, 3. See the entire end of this sermon. Extract in the office of St. Teresa of Lisieux, 3rd nocturn.

[7] See below p. 135.

[8] *P. L.*, 54, 581-1218.

[9] The remainder are letters received by Leo.

[10] See chiefly *Epist.* 28 (Tome to Flavian) 59, 124, 129, 139, 165.

[11] See below, *Pontificate.*

[12] Like his sermons, Leo's letters contain a cursus or metrical movement to which grammarians have given the name of *cursus leoninus.* H. Guisar, *Hist, de Rome et des Papes au .if.* z/., Paris, p. 330 sq.

Saint Leo's sermons reveal him as a moralist[1]. His letters show that in the full meaning of the term he was a man of authority and government. His *intellectual qualities* macle him peculiarly fitted for action : clear precise and vigorous, he instinctively grasped the practical aspect of all questions and held vain subtilities in horror. Gifted moreover with a strong and tenacious w/ZZ,he was accustomed to make up his mind frankly and unhesitatingly, and then, no matter what difficulties arose, to keep to the path he had chosen, without weakness, but also without obstinacy. The many dreadful happenings of which he was a witness have left scarcely a trace of feeling in his letters : " Unshakable in all the serenity of his soul, Leo writes as he speaks, as he never ceased to think, to feel and to act, *as a Roman.* On hearing him, on seeing him at his work, the senators of Valentinian must surely have thought of their colleagues of the old republic, those unconquerable souls that no trial could ever dismay2". But it is not in this trait that we must look for the secret of his character, but rather in the depths of his Christian instincts which were nourished by a faith as fearless as it was simple. The *fides catholica* was one of his great rules in the struggle against heresy; another, almost as important, was his respect for tradition, so well expressed in his own words : *Vetustatis norma servetur.* To all these traits he added an unparalleled dignity, which, combined with a very real modesty, was based on the deep consciousness of his heavy responsibility as Bishop of Rome and successor of St. Peter, as will be seen in the following study of his pontificate and teaching.

II. SAINT LEO'S PONTIFICATE.

Of particular importance are the great events which show how Leo set himself out with untiring watchfulness to defend Christian unity both in the doctrinal and the disciplinary order, in the East and in the West.

A) Saint Leo and Christian unity.

i. In the West[3]. Saint Leo vigorously defended the purity of faith against the heresies. The *Manichceans*

1 P. Batiffol, in *Did. thiol.*, col. 278 sq.
3 Mgr. Duchesne, *Hist. Aue. del'Eglise* in, 680-681.
3 See P. Batiffol, *Le Siège Apostolique,* ρ. 418-482.

driven from Africa by the Vandals, began to spread their teaching in Italy and even in Rome, where they scandalised the people by their shamefully immoral practices. Saint Leo ordered their books to be burned, gave up the most obstinate among them to the secular arm, and caused severe laws to be passed against heretics [1]. Belated *Pelagians* were found almost everywhere. From these St. Leo exacted a formal retractation [2] and in the case of clerks, forbade them to be raised, even after retractation, to a higher order [3]. At this time Spain also was disturbed by the *Priscillian* heresy, a kind of mitigated Manichaeism [4]. The Spanish bishops, especially Turribius, Bishop of Astorga, were strongly urged by Leo to resist this error to the utmost, and on this occasion he also sent them a doctrinal formula concerning the Priscillian errors [5]. In consequence the heresy lost ground but still lingered on for nearly a century.

Disciplinary authority, as his letters witness, was strongly wielded by Saint Leo. In *Africa* he insisted on the observance of the canonical observations concerning ordinations and stressed the need and discussed the means of procuring a body of clergy worthy of its state [6]. In *Gaul* he was obliged to revoke certain measures which Saint Hilary, Archbishop of Arles, overstepping his jurisdiction, had taken against two bishops [7]. The Archbishop himself was deprived of metropolitan jurisdiction over a part of the Roman province of Vienne. Later, Leo asserted his claim [8] to high jurisdiction over four dioceses and refused to restore to Arles its lost rights [9], although remaining on very friendly

[1] Constitution of Valentinian III (445). *Inter S. Leon, epist.*, 8. See *semi.* 9, t6, 22, 24, 34, 42, 47, and chiefly 76. Cf. P. BATIFFOL, S', *Leon,* 1. c., col. 228, 234. — [2] *Epist.* 2.

[3] *Epist.* 18. — [4] See vol. 1, p. 606-607.

[5] *Epist.*, 15. (The syllabus on the Priscillian errors contains 16 chapters).

[6] *Epist.* 12. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, col. 241-242.

[7] Saint Hilary had probably thought that he was acting within his rights, since the title of vicar had been conferred by the pope on Patrocles, Bishop of Arles (then the seat of the Prefect of Gaul). St. Boniface, however, had abolished this ephemeral primacy. See St. Leo's letter to lhe metropolitan bishops of Vienne. *Epist. 10.*

[8] In spite of a demand from 19 bishops of the provinces of Vienne, Narbonne and Provence. See the pope's reply, *Epist. 66* (5th May 450). Hilary died in 449 and was followed by Ravennius who was in high favour with the pope.

[9] Some authors have imagined Hilary as the mouthpiece of Gallican ecclesiastical tradition, defending its autonomy against Rome. The truth is on the other side. Leo was endeavouring to maintain, as he did everywhere, the metropolitan rights established against the new and encroaching primacies.

terms with Hilary's successor In all these matters the pope acted with supreme and unquestioned authority. In *Eastern Illyricum**, which was attached to the patriarchate of Rome, Leo acted much as he had done in Gaul : he did not hesitate in condemning the action of his own vicar, the Archbishop *of* Thessalonica, who had abused his delegated authority in order to override the rights of the local metropolitans : in no other document, says Grisar " did the pope use such grave and energetic terms " as he did in admonishing this prelate to make a wise and moderate use of his authority λ

2. In the East the Christological controversies threatened the *unity offaith**. Saint Leo, conscious of his supreme authority in doctrinal matters was careful to define the revealed truth in his *Letter to Flavians* and sent precise instructions to the Council 6.* These ordinances having been wholly disregarded 7 by the *Robber Council of Ephesus* (449), Leo consented, after the death of Theodosius II, and on the instances of the new emperor, to the holding of a new council at *Chalcedon.* He insisted, however, that this fresh council should be presided by his legates and held in his name8. " Moreover" says Regnier9, "the many general instructions issued by the pope in view of the coming council... show that he was firmly resolved from the very outset to guide the entire

' He charged him with informing the whole of Gaul of the date of Easter, and with obtaining the bishops' subscription to his letter to Flavian. *Epist.* 67. Ravennius' reply *inter S. Leon, epist.*, 99.

3 The Roman Empire numbered four dioceses or provinces in the Balkans. *Thrace* near Constantinople had always belonged to the East; *Illyricum* near the Adriatic was always part of the West. Between these two, *Dacia* (as far as the Danube) and *Macedonia* (the whole of Greece including Crete) belonged to the West until 379, after which they were attached to the East and became the single prefecture of Eastern Illyricum having Thessalonica as its centre. The popes, however, still retained these provinces in the Patriarchate of Rome, and, in order to safeguard them, established the vicariate of Thessalonica (See vol. i, p. 518) which endured until the schism of Acacius. See L. Duchesne, *Eglises répartes,* p. 229-279. P. Batiffol, *Le Siège apost.,* p. 245-265.

3 *Epist.* 14. Cf. *Epist.* 6 (to the same). See also *Epist.* 5, 13 (to the metropolitans of Illyricum).

4 See P. Batiffol, *Siège apostolique,* p. 493-589.

5 *L.,* 54, 755-782 (Latin and Greek text). Fr. trans, in Amann, *Le dogme catholique dans les Pères,* p. 344-355. See above p. 54.

6 *Epist.,* 33. — ' See above p. 54.

8 Vice mea synodo convenit præsidere *Epist.* 89 to Marcian (24th June 451). The three legates who were present, the bishops Paschasinus and Lucentius with the priest Boniface, did, in fact, preside at the council. *Etdst.* 103.

' *Op. cit.,* p. 101-102.

proceedings with a firm and wise hand... Nothing was to be decided save in the presence of his legates, and the Council's whole aim must be to further the cause of unity and peace. He advised the avoidance of renewed discussions on matters of faith : enough that his Letter to Flavian be accepted and that thenceforth the Council should abide by the decisions of Nicea and Ephesus. He recommended kindly treatment of those who recanted their errors, but severity towards those who persisted in a spirit of revolt... Dioscurus was not to be admitted to the Council on any pretext, except he was brought as an accused person. Finally, he counselled resistance to those, who, insisting on the importance of their episcopal towns, were greedy to usurp new rights [1]". Saint Leo thus spoke with authority not only on questions of faith, but also in disciplinary matters.

When the Council met, Leo's authority was not called in question and his instructions were generally respected. The Dogmatic Letter was accepted as the very teaching of Peter[2]. The few bishops who were troubled with scruples received satisfactory explanations from the legates in the course of the following days and approved the letter in their turn. When the Council had brought its labours to an end [3], it wrote to the pope asking him to confirm all its decisions [4]

[1] See *Epist.* 89, 90, 94 to Marcian; 91 to zXnatolius; 92 to Julian of Cos; 93 to the Council ; 95 to Pulcheria.

[2] Saint Leo's letter was acclaimed in the following manner: "There is the faith of the Fathers, the faith of the Apostles! It is thus that we, and all the orthodox, believe ! *Peter has spoken through Leo!* In such a way did the Apostles teach ! Leo has taught in piety and truth ! Thus did Cyril teach ! May he be remembered for ever ! Leo and Cyril have taught in the same way !" Mansi, VI, p. 913. The Fathers of Chalcedon in naming Cyril signified their agreement with those of Ephesus (431). But how much greater was the part played by Saint Leo ! — [3] See above p. 56.

[4] Such is Ilefele's opinion *(Hist, des Conciles** 11, S46). II. Leclercq, however, holds an entirely different opinion, for which he gives his reasons at length, *ibid,* (note) 847-850. The conciliar}' Fathers in their letter to St. Leo whom they usually call "sanctissime et beatissime pater" (see the subscriptions), say : "... Thou hast been for us the interpreter of the voice of Blessed Peter " ; we were together some five hundred bishops " whom thou didst guide as a head guides the members"; we have dealt justly with Dioscurus who dared to render to Eutyches "the dignity of which your Holiness had stripped him ", and who even had the "foolishness" to rise up against "him who received from the Lord Himself the stewardship of tne vineyard, κατ' αυτού τού τή αμπέλου την ©υλακήν παρά τού Σωτήρο επιτετραμμένου " and who had dreamed of excommunicating "him who endeavours to unite the whole body of the Church, ζατά τού το σώμα τή εκκλησία ενούν σπουδάζοντα ". According to this, it is by the command of the Saviour Himself that the pope seeks to unite the Church.

or at least to approve its last disciplinary enactment, *canon 28* \ which the legates had refused to accept. The pope refused his approval of this canon 2 which was prejudicial to the patriarchal sees of the Orient and which threatened, in its essentials, *to displace the centre of Catholic unity.* His zeal in obstructing the ambitions 3 of the Archbishop of Constantinople is thus explained.

Nothing that touched the unity of the Church left the pope unmoved. Hence the importance he attached to the date of Easter, which in itself was an apparently minor question. The earlier controversies had been brought definitely to an end by the Council of Nicea when it condemned the *Quarto-decinians* (who wanted to celebrate Easter on the 14th Nisan as did the Jews), and fixed this feast on the Sunday which follows the full moon of March. To Alexandria was given the task of determining this date and of notifying it to the Churches and especially to Rome. In the middle of the fifth century, however, the correctness of the Alexandrian calculations began to be doubted in the West. While Proterius the Alexandrian Patriarch refused to hear of any change and the West continued to clamour for a revision of the computation, Leo decided to stand by the Egyptian calculations through "solicitude for unity, which must be safeguarded at all costs"4. The purpose indicated in these words dominates the whole life of the great pope.

B) Saint Leo and the princes.

Saint Leo's position made it necessary for him to have frequent relations with the princes and these he always endeavoured to make as friendly as possible. In the East he crossed swords with the Court under *Theodosius II*, but the initiative did not come from him. In *Marciati,* Theodosius' successor, however, he found a prince entirely devoted to the orthodox religion and the Apostolic See. This ruler, it is true, either of himself or on the instances of an exacting administration

See above p. 56 and vol. I, p. 305.

3 He declared that he did not even know (i. c. recognise) this canon, alleged to be from the Council of 381.

3 The true danger was not so much in the canon itself as in this subversive tendency which any weakness on the part of the pope would have aggravated. In this matter St. Leo differed from *Julian of Cos,* his faithful counsellor in the East. Julian, Bishop of Kos (Sporades) who was an Italian by birth and who h-irl prtnrntpH in Rnm«'. was an invaluable aid to the legates at Chalcedon. from 453 to 457. Many of his letters are

3') τ37> 142· Cf. Regnier, *of>. at.,*

took certain measures which appeared to be State interference in religious affairs (i. e., convocation of an (Ecumenical Council in the East; nomination of a lay commission to follow the sessions ; the demand for the approbation of canon 28 etc.) ; but he never compromised the entente with Rome. To this happy state of affairs the pope's moderateness and firmness contributed in great measure. Another precious element for the maintenance of peace was the diplomacy of Ju ian of Cos ', accredited representative of the pope at Constantinople who acted as a kind of nuncio or apocrisarius a. Saint Leo had to be extremely vigilant in his dealings with the emperor, *Leo I*, (457-474) in order to maintain the findings of the Council of Chalcedon and to keep the Monophysites out of the great sees on which they had set their hearts. And in order to resist the violence of these heretics the Church counted on the support of the State. The latter's function as protector of the Church explains in what sense the pope applied to the princes the bold metaphor of the priesthood expressed in the words "præter regiam coronam, etiam sacerdotalem palmam ℣."

In the West there also existed "a concerted and continuous entente of the two powers". In 450 on the pope' request, the emperor, \7alentinian II, together with his mother and his wife, wrote to the Court of Constantinople in order to smooth down certain religious difficulties. Already by 445 Saint Leo had obtained an important edict from the emperor against the Manichaeans 4 and had at least inspired the famous constitution of July 8th 445 s, which was provoked by an abuse of power on the part of Hilary of Arles 6. In this constitution the prince recalls the glories of imperial Rome, but what is more important slows that the primacy of Saint Peter is the foundation of the primacy of the Apostolic See. By this act, says Mgr. Batiffol, "the emperor turned the primacy of the Roman See to the advantage of the Empire of the West in a far greater measure than the pope found his primacy strengthened by the emperor's support7." It is quite gratuitously that Protestants and Jansenists have taken this document as manifest proof of ambition on the part of the holy pontiff8.

Leo's ascendency was felt even by the invading hordes from the North. The story of how he confronted *Attila* at Mantua in 452 is well known. The self-styled scourge of God gave way before the pontiff's imposing yet simple grandeur, abandoned his plan of advance on Rome and withdrew beyond the Danube 9. Three years later, in 455, Leo met

1 See note above. — 3 See J. Pargoire, *Apocrisaires,* in *Did. Arch.,* 2543 sq.
3 *Epist.* in, 3 (to Marcian). In letter 166, 6 (to Leo I), he writes of the "Emperor's priestly and Apostolic spirit". See P. BATIFFOL, *op. cit.,* col. 299.
4 *Inter S. Leon, epist.* 8. — 5 *Inter S. Leon, epist.* II.
6 See above, p. 127 and below p. 165. — 7 *Op. cit.,* 239.
1 M. Babut opined that letter 10 (see p. 140) and the Constitution of Valentinian which accompanied it, formed, as it were, the charter of the pontifical monarchy, ultimately based on an act of the sovereign. Such a view confounds the terms "recognise" and "create". Had the "ecclesiastical monarchy" no other support but the Empire it would have been involved in its fall.
'SeeS. Prosper, *Chronic.,* year 452. Later accounts, which in our opinion date from about 800, relate that the barbarian chieftain saw Saints Peter and Paul brandishing swords above the pope's head. Cf. H. Grisar, *Hist, de Rome...* (fr. trans.) vol. I, p. 332.

with less success when he failed to prevent *Gensericus* from putting Rome to pillage for the space of a fortnight ; but he prevailed on the fierce heretic to restrain his men from firing the buildings and murdering or torturing the inhabitants[1]. It may seem strange that no trace of these terrible calamities which had befallen the Empire is to be found in the writings of Saint Leo. No doubt this strong willed man would have considered it a sign of weakness so to have betrayed his feelings. Saint Leo died in 461 probably on November nth and was declared a Doctor of the Church by Benedict xiv in 1745.

III. THE DOCTRINE OF SAINT LEO[3].

Saint Leo was a Doctor rather than a theologian : this is a character especially becoming to a pope, and one which, in the case of Saint Leo, was more adapted to his intellectual qualities. " It is in no wise derogatory to Saint Leo to say that his culture was not comparable with that of Saint Ambrose or Saint Augustine. He professed an undisguised contempt for the philosophy of this world, *institutes ab hominibus versutiæ disputandi*[3]. No trace of classical reading is to be found in his writings; he knew no Greek (it was no longer known in Rome[4]); and it is not clear what ecclesiastical writers he had studied, with the exception perhaps of Saint Augustine. It was his desire that dogmatic teaching should be given in the clear light of truth, stripped of useless rhetorical appeals to the senses. Leo stood out above all for authority, for *discipline in faith,* for the things that have been acquired and remain indisputable. \\ hether the *Præteritorum Sedis Apostolices episcoporum auctoritates de gratia Deis* are from his hand or not, they undoubtedly correspond to his outlook, which exactly interpreted the Roman policy and which is well expressed in Leo's favoured maxim[6]* *Vetustatis norma servetur*[1]. It is characteristic of the man that he should prefer to meditate the *depositum custodi* of Saint Paul rather than the parable of the grain of mustard seed, extolled asasymbol of progress by his contemporary Saint λΓincent of Lerins[8].

1 See *ibid.*, p. 79-S2. —3 General survey in P. Bath FOL, *op. cit.,* col. 278-300.
3 *64, 2- — 4 *Epist.* 113, 4. — 5 See above p. 123.
- *Epist.* 129, 2 ; ""Per omnia igitur, et in *fidei* regula et in observantia *disciplina* vetustatis norma servetur".
'I B. Batiffol, *op. cif.,* col. 279.
8 See below p. 168. But in addition to mentioning *universitas* and *consensio* as criteria of truth. Vincent also sjieaks of *antiquitas,* which is no other than St Leo s *vetustas,* 1. e. tradition.

A) Christolog-y.

Saint Leo developed his *Christological* writings toa greater extent than any other and it is in these that his doctrinal tendences are the better revealed. His essential ideas 1 have already been summarised and it has been shown that his were the formulas that were to guide both the Western and the Eastern Church in the course of the grave controversies that were to sweep them with unheard of violence for more than a hundred years. In his famous *Tome to Flavian* he lost no time in vain speculation or the discussion of minor points : he contented himself with expressing the object of faith in a few trenchant expressions, as concrete in form as possible and remarkably exact2.* In his sermons, which, as we have said, were to a great extent devoted to the mysteries of the Man-God, the clarity and precision of his teachings is in no way obviated by his oratorical presentation, and strong emphasis is laid on the moral consequences which result from it for the Christian man.

Of no less importance is Saint Leo's Soteriological teaching. The Incarnation was postulated in a certain measure4 by the Redemption. Only a God-Man could lead fallen humanity back to God; and such a one must be not only true God but also true man5. In many passages Saint Leo taught that human nature, corrupted by sin and death, has found its remedy and source of renewal in the Divine nature with which it has become allied6. He has therefore been rightly claimed7*as a partisan of the *mystical theory* of the Redemption h, at least in the sense that the Incarnation is the principle of our ransom. But since, for Saint Leo, the latter is primarily the effect of the Passion and Death of Our Saviour, the *realist theory* seems to correspond more exactly to his teaching. He says : "The Passion of Christ contains the sacrament of our salvation"9. The Death of Jesus Christ 10 which is a true

1 See above p. 54.

2 In addition to *Epist.* 28, may be consulted *Epist.* 31, 35, 59, 124, 165 (to Leo 1), and many *sermons,* 21, 25, 27, 28, 46, 47, 53, 62, 64, 65, 68, 69, 72, 91, 96. See p. 123.

J In several sermons composed previous to Monophysitism may be noted several ambiguous expressions, such as "'ita ut naturae alteri altera misceretur". *(Senn.* 23, i).

4 It would not seem that Leo contradicted Augustine's affirmation that God could have redeemed man in many ways *(aliis innumerabilibus modis}, De Trinitate Kill,* 21. He spoke rather of a relative necessity founded on God's mercy *(Senn.* 12, 1).

í *Senn.* 54, 1-2. Our salvation supposes in the Redeemer the existence of lhe two natures that we are taught by faith. — 6 *Senn.* 24, 2 ; 25, 5.

7 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Domi,,* in. p. 353'355- — * See vol. 1, p. 352.

9 *Senn.* 55, 1. Passio Christi salutis nostræ continet sacramentum.

10 *Semi.* 59, i ; 64, 4.

sacrificel is the cause of our salvation. Such is Saint Leo's usual theme. The better to emphasise this view he frequently refers to the intervention of the *devil* who, by causing the death of the innocent Christ, *oversteps* the power he had formerly received over guilty mankind and thus sees himself "justly" spoiled of his prey2. But Saint Leo was not referring to any "rights of the devil" in any true sense *of* the term, though he favoured the notion that the devil was ignorant of God's plan of the Incarnation and a redeeming Sacrifice3.

B) Grace.

In Saint Leo's teaching on Christ may be recognised Saint Augustine's influence. This influence is found in still greater measure in his theology of grace, his insistence on the fallen state of mankind 4, and the part he ascribes to concupiscence in the transmission of original sin 5. His general attitude seems to correspond to that taken by the Roman Church : a frank affirmation of the authority of the great Doctor and ex elicit condemnation of the Semipelagian error that man is able to begin the work of his salvation by good desires and holy thoughts, or correspond by his own powers alone to the call of God. On the other hand, an absolute suspension of judgement regarding the "deeper and more difficult questions" which no one had the boldness to dismiss outright, but which, it was considered, called for no solution. Such is the gist of the document, apparently composed by Leo, which was appended to Saint Celestine's letter to the bishops of Gaul 6.

- This theory of the devil's abuse of his power had already been put forward in the writings of a number of Oriental and Western Fathers such as Chrysostom, Theodoret, Hilary, Ambrosiaster and even Augustine. See J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption* p. 395-414; *La rédemption dans S. Augustin,* in *Rev. Se. Rei.,* 1927-1928. This theory seems to have been no more than a popular method of explaining the doctrine of satisfaction to the faithful. Its chief aim appears to have been to show that God redeemed mankind from sin and from its remotest consequences, even that hateful slavery which is the punishment of sin. This viewpoint, which is not without its practical advantages, was adopted by many of the Fathers who followed St. Leo. The scholastics, however, who were exclusively theologians, restrained themselves to a more sober explanation. In this respect their teaching marks a real advance on that of the Fathers : they went directly to essentials.

3 *Serm.* 69, 4. Cf. *Serm.* 60, 3 ; 63, 3.

4 Lethali vulnere tabefacta. *Serm.* 24, 2. See 23, 2; 25, 5; 30, 6; 52, 1.

s *Serm.,* 24, 2-3; 25, 4; 27, 2. As a consequence he shows the relation between Christ's exemption from original sin and Mary's virginal conception. *Serm.* 22, 2-3. He often speaks of the virginity of Mary *(Serm.* 23, 1 ; 24, 5; 30, 4; *Epist.* 35, 5) and her Divine Motherhood *(Serm. 26, 1 ;* 27, 2 ; 28, 5; 35, I ; 37, I ; 62. 2; *Epist.* 59. 5 ; 124, 9).

6 See above p. 123. Cf. J. Fixeront, *Hist. Do^m.,* in, p. 290-291.

Saint Leo describes in truly augustinian terms the action of grace in the soul, attributing to it not only the "*perficere*" but also the "*velle*" : *Non est dubium hominem bona agentem ex Deo habere et effectum operis et initium voluntatis* x. The fact of willing the good and hating evil is the proof that God Who works in us 2 has accorded us these dispositions and wills to give us the means of perfecting them 3. We are "temples of God" which can be "neither begun nor completed" without God's help. But the pope also insists on the need of responding to grace, of loving and seeking Him Who first loved and sought for us 4. And in these words the pope shows himself as a *moral teacher*, before all zealous 5 in pressing exhortations to fight against the passions, to act and to love 6. We must go forward : "He who does not advance retreats, and he who gains nothing loses something" 7.

C) The Sacraments.

Varied and interesting information is to be found on the Sacraments in Saint Leo's sermons and letters. The "Sacramentary" which bears his name would form a useful addition to this information did we but know to what extent he contributed, even in an indirect and remote way, to the compilation of this collection 8 9

I. Saint Leo writes often enough of Baptism. He gives details of the principal *rites:* the profession of faith by means of the *redditio symboli* 9; Baptism in the proper sense of the word conferred by threefold immersion *(trina demersio)* 10, and then the anointing which was, as it were, its complement". Baptism effaces original sin and gives supernatural

x *Serm.* 38, 3.

2 Non de nobis præsumimus, sed de illo qui operatur in nobis. *Senn.* 3, i.

3 Ipse qui dedit velle donabit et posse, ut simus cooperatores operum ejus. *Serui.* 26. 4. See also *Sertu.* 3, 1 ; 79. 2 ; 94, 2. — 4 *Ser/n.* 48, I.

5 See above p. 125. — 6 *Senn.* 3, 4; 4, 4; 8; 80, i ; 92, 2 ; 94, 2.

7 Qui non proficit deficit et qui nihil acquirit non nihil perdit. Currendum eruo nobis est fidei gressibus, misericordi» operibus, amore justitiæ. *Senn.* 59, 8.

8 The Leonine Sacramentary (*Z. Z.*, 55, 21-156; critical edit, by Feltoe, Cambridge, 1896), preserved in a seventh-century manuscript, is the earliest known form of the Roman Missal. Mgr Duchesne thinks this is a private work not written before the end of the sixth century, although the author made frequent borrowings from Saint Leo. Many liturgisls, however, still regard it as a fifth-century composition and attribute it, at least in part, to Saint Leo. See p. *Gelasian Sacra/ncntary).* and p. 242 *Gregorian Sacramentary).*

9 *Ser/n.* 24, 6. Cf. *Epist.* 124, 8. — 10 *Senn.* 70, 4.

« *Epist.·,* 16, 6. As regards the renouncing of the devil, see *Ser/n.* 57, 5; 64, 6; 66, 3.

life[1]. It is efficacious even when administered by heretics, provided the Trinitarian formula is used[2][3]. The latter are to be reconciled by a laying on of hands[3], "which over a long period would seem to have held the place of Confirmation"[4], especially as it was sometimes accompanied by anointing. Confirmation properly so-called, administered by the laying on of hands was in fact accompanied by anointing with the holy chrism *(consignatio)* from the sixth century in Rome. Saint Leo calls it the *sanctificatio chrismatum* [5].

As regards the Holy Eucharist we need only recall that Saint Leo is a valuable witness to the doctrine of the Real Presence. The reality of the Eucharistic Body of Christ even provides him with an argument against Monophysitism[6][7]

2. The question of Penance often arises in Saint Leo's writings, which furnish us with important details regarding this sacrament. Much light is thrown on the state of penitential discipline as it was at the beginning of the evolution it was to undergo from the fifth to the eighth century. In the following lines we give a short survey of the general tendency and the term of this discipline [7].

Penance, taken integrally, comprises three elements which may be likened to the three parts of the sacrament : *confession, expiation* in a strict sense, and *absolution.* The evolution of which we speak occurred chiefly in the second and the third of these elements.

i. Confession is required for all grave and mortal faults[8] and not merely for the three sins "ad mortem" i. e., apostasy, adultery and murder, which by some were considered as the type or highest genus of the sins against God, oneself and one's neighbour. This detailed confession is *secret* and it is wrong to suppose that any public accusation must precede the exomologesis or expiation properly so-called. The practice current in certain Italian churches of publicly reading the

[1] After Saint Augustine, Baptism came to be regarded as a rite of purification and regeneration rather than a rite of initiation. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, in, p. 371. — [2] *Epist.*, 159, 7. — [3] *Ibid.*

[4] J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogni.*, in, p. 372-373.

[5] *Serin.* 66, 2. Cf. *Semi.* 4, 1 ; 59, 7.

[6] *Semi.* 91, 2-3. This text has become classical : "Sic sacræ mensæ communicare debetis, ut nihil prorsus de veritate corporis Christi et sanguine ambigatis". The same notion is found in *Epist.* 59, 2, where he declares that even children discover the "veritas corporis et sanguinis Christi inter communionis sacramenta".

[7] For this survey we are chiefly indebted to the excellent general outline given by J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, in, p. 387-414. See also P. Batiffol, *Etudes d'Hist, et de thiol, posit.*, (1920), 1st series, p. 145-193 (penitentiaries and penitents, 4th — 5th cent). — [8] See vol. I, p. 205, 54, 606, 698.

penitents' written confessions was put down and blamed by St. Leo in the name of tradition. There is no doubt that he referred to secret confession : " Cum reatus conscientiarum sufficiat solis sacerdotibus indicari confessione secreta" ; and Saint Leo, far from introducing the contrary use, as some have claimed, held it to be "opposed to Apostolic ruling : Contra apostolicam regulam " *.

2. The *solemn* form of expiation was especially harsh, *a)* It began in the church when the bishop laid his hands on the penitent dressed in robes of mourning[3]. It was of long duration and even when it was accomplished it was forbidden to the reconciled penitent to take any public office, to join the army, undertake any commercial venture and even to marry or enjoy the privileges of marriage. Saint Leo, although he did not suppress these early uses, accords a kind of dispensation of these engagements taken by the reconciled penitent[3], and, in some cases, considers their violation as no more than a slight fault [4]. Furthermore, he combated the rigour of those bishops who denied the sacrament and reconciliation *in articulo mortis* to sinners who, through fear of the obligations it entailed had refrained over a long period from approaching this sacrament[5], *b)* The greatest tempering of the discipline is to be found in *private penance.* This comprised, first, the confession of sins, and also for a long period the public absolution of great sinners on Holy Thursday. The acts of satisfaction which followed the confession and preceded the absolution were accomplished privately by the penitent. In consequence the latter was not bound by any of the obligations inherent to " solemn " penance. Even in St. Augustine's time this form of double penance[6] was known, and it is quite possible that it dates from even earlier times [7]. It is indisputable that Saint Leo exhorts the faithful to the former in several sermons[8]. It was not yet, of course, absolutely private penance[9], since pardon was vouchsafed only through the " supplicationes sacerdotum ". This private form of canonical penance continued to evolve after the fifth century, and, after the eighth, became almost the only form in use, even for serious faults. On the other hand, the fervour of the faithful led them to submit themselves to such penance in order to obtain

'Epist. 168 (to 459 bishops of Campania,...) ; *I\ L.,* 54, 1210-1211.

3 Which had to be worn for the whole time of penance with the hair cut short. But in Spain in the seventh century the penitent kept his beard and hair unshorn " ut demonstrent abundantiam criminum quibus caput peccatoris gravatur ".

3 See chiefly *Epist.* 108 (written in 452 to Theodore of Fréjus) and *Epist.* 167 (written in 458 or 459, to Rusticus, Bishop of Narbonne). Cf. P. Batiffol, 5. *Lion,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 275-276.

4 *Epist.* 167, 10-13.

5 *Epist.* 108, 4-5; *Epist.* 167, 9.

6Saint Augustine refers to the one as *"luctuosa, lamentabilis, gravior ";* and says that the other is accomplished " *quibusdam medicamentis correptionum* ". *De fide et operibus,* 48; *Semi.* 82, Π.

7 Tixeront inclines to this opinion. *Hist. Dogm.,* ni, p. 395.

% *Semi.* 43, 2-3; 44, I ; 49, 1-2; 50, 1-2.

9 We refer here only to "canonical" or sacramental penance and not to that which the faithful may and should perform privately, independently of all official intervention on the part *of* the Church. — - — .

absolution even for their venial faults. Finally it was permitted to confess not once, but time after time [1]. The practice of confession became more widespread through the influence of monastic institutions[2].

3. Absolution, according to Saint Leo, was given by a *deprecatory* formula[3]. It was accorded only after expiation. In fatal illnesses, however, it was given immediately after confession; but this was the last resource and Saint Leo advised sinners not to await this extremity before repenting[4][5]. But in course of time, other circumstances made the immediate application of absolution customary in all cases. The power of absolution belongs ultimately to the bishop in his diocese, but gradually, especially after the filth century, as the practice of confession became more widespread, the bishops appointed priests as ordinary ministers of the Sacrament of Penance. Saint Leo considered these priests as being properly judges of the culpability of the penitents. The lack of clergy capable of carrying out this work soon made it necessary to have recourse to the penitential books and canons[6,7], a practice which, far from representing a progress, was merely a temporary yet necessary palliative, occasioned by the mediocrity of the clergy.

3. The priesthood is transmitted by a consecration or a "blessing", called a "sacrament" by Saint Leo, and was to be conferred only on Sundays[7]. The sacerdotal hierarchy was made up of three great orders, the episcopate, the priesthood and the diaconato, which had to be given successively[8]. The subdiaconate or "fourth order" already makes its appearance in the obligation of celibacy, which, of course, was incumbent also on those who received the higher orders[9]. Saint Leo debarred slaves from the priesthood on account of its great dignity[10]. Especially did he close to them the ranks of the episcopacy: *sacrum ministerium talis consortii vilitate polluitur*. We should not see in these words an indication of pride, or contempt of the lowly, but rather an act of homage paid to the greatness of the priestly office. It was due to a similar sentiment that clergy in major orders, even though guilty of public crimes, were exempted from solemn canonical penance: Saint Leo desired them to be deposed, but

1 The early rule regarding the non-repetition of solemn penance discouraged many sinners, little confident in their strength and desirous of making certain of the consolation of the "only plank of salvation" to be hoped for after Baptism.

8 See below, p. 276. Cf. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, III, p. 397-402.

3 Ut indulgentia Dei nisi supplicationibus sacerdotum nequeat obtineri. *Epist.* 108, 2. Cf. *ibid.*. 3.

4 *Epist.* 108, 5.

5 *Epist.* 10, 8: 159, 5-6. This development was in part due to the institution of rural parishes.

6 See below, p. 275.

7 *Epist.* 9, i. Cf. *Epist.* nr, 2.

• *Epist.* 12, 5. — 9 *Epist.* 14, 14. — 10 *Epist.* 4.

forbade them to be placed in the ranks of the penitents[1]. They still had access to private penance and as the latter became more usual, the clergy were not the last to make use of it, excited thereto by their fervour, before they were obliged by canonical regulations, such as those of Saint Chrodegand, Bishop of Metz, from 742 to 754[2].

D) The Church.

The specific difficulties which arose while Saint Leo occupied the Chair of Peter led him to reflect in a greater measure than any of his predecessors on the great importance of unity in the Church. His teaching on this point is particularly worthy of notice. He considered that the *foundations* of this unity lie in the very nature of the Church which is the virgin-spouse of the one man Jesus Christ *(Virgo Ecclesia, sponsa unius viri Christi)*, and also His Mystical Body[3]. But Leo was no unpractical theorist. He set himself out to fulfil the will of Christ by clarifying the concrete conditions of unity.

The chief conditions emphasised by Saint Leo were 1) *unity of faith*, which he endeavoured to maintain and strengthen by striving against heresy with unremitting zeal[4]; 2) the *agreement of the clergy* and particularly bishops *(concordia sacerdotum)*, among themselves, founded on a recognition of one another's powers; just as in the Apostolic college there was a certain distribution of functions *(discretio potestatis)*, so, now, the bishops should restrain their action to the limits of their own provinces and refrain from encroaching on the rights of others. This was the principle on which Leo based his opportune reminder to the Bishop of Thessalonica[5], and by which he himself was guided in his relations with Hilary of Arles and Anatolius of Constantinople; 3) The *primacy of Peter* and his successors, the bishops of Rome: just as the Apostles, although they were equal by the choice of Christ, had to submit to one who became their leader, so also must the bishops, even those in important towns and having a greater responsibility, subject themselves to a head and give him the obedience they themselves expect from their own subjects[6]; this head is Peter, on whom is built the whole of the spiritual edifice, the faith and the hierarchy[7].

1 *Epist,* 167, 2.
2 See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* III, p. 404, 412.
3 *Epist.* 80, 1-2. — 4 See above p. 126 sq. — 5 *Epist.,* 14, II.
6 *Ibid.* — 7 *Serm.* 3, 2; 4, 1; etc.

Saint Leo was the first pope to place such insistent emphasis on the divine origin of the pontifical power. His attitude is explained by the political and worldly motives of the ambitious, whom he was forced to withstand. Throughout his *letters* we find him appealing to this principle and impressing it on his correspondents [*]. But it is in his sermons that his ideas on this subject are more amply and eloquently developed. Sermons 2-5 and 82-83 are especially famous. In the first, preached on the occasion of his ordination, it would be difficult to decide whether his saintly modesty or his profound conviction of his mission is the more admirable. Though full of deference for the other bishops, he nevertheless attributed to himself "the primacy of all" [3] of which the honour descends from Saint Peter; "for Peter endures: his *dignitas* cannot fail, his *sollicitudo* is ever vigilant, his *potestas* lives, his *auctoritas* excels, he is still at the helm of the Church : he is the perpetual bishop of that See, *omnium episcoporum primas, totius Ecclesia* princeps [3]. Saint Leo was conscious that all these titles of the Apostle could be claimed by the Bishop of Rome and were indeed ascribed to him by the universal Church, *dum ad beati apostoli Petri sedem ex toto orbe concurritur"*[4]5

The Roman privileges are assimilated to those of the chief Apostle in sermons 82-83, preached on the feast of SS. Peter and Paul. The following passage in which Leo apostrophises the eternal city is well known : " Isti enim sunt viri per quos tibi Evangelium Christi, Roma, resplenduit; et quæ eras magistra erroris, facta es discipula veritatis... Isti sunt qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt, ut *gens sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotalis et regia,* per sacram beati Petri sedem *caput orbis effecta,* latius praesideres religione divina quam dominatione terrena. Quamvis enim multis aucta victoriis jus imperii tui terra marique protuleris, minus tamen est quod tibi bellicus labor subdidit *quam quod pax Christiana subjecit"* [s]. As this passage indicates, Saint Leo considered not only the Churches of the Roman Empire as being subject to Rome but also those that had been founded beyond its frontiers. Nothing was better calculated to mark the universality of the Roman jurisdiction.

The force of Christian Rome, moreover, did not derive from the Empire. " Saint Leo was certainly sensible of the past greatness of Rome and he knew what the preaching of the Gospel owed to that city which had united the world under its laws. Further, he was not unacquainted with the emperors of his own time, and he praised them for their piety,... but at the time in which he lived, Rome owed nothing of her prestige to them[6]. To Leo's mind the

[*] *Etnst.* 10, 12, 14, 69, 80, etc.

[3] The bishops " ei principaliter deferunt, quem non solum hujus Sedis praesulem, sed et omnium episcoporum noverunt esse primatem *Senn.* 3, 4.

[3] *Senn.* 4, 4.

[4] *Semi.* 5, 2. Cf. P. Batiffol, 5. *Léon,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 222.

[5] *Senn.* S2, 1.

[d] In the fifth century Rome had greatly declined from a political viewpoint, since die emperors resided in other towns.

prestige of Rome was henceforth purely Christian : Rome lad her martyrs for a diadem and their blood was her purple. Rome is the head of the world by reason of the See of Peter : after having been the *arx romani imperii,* she is become the *arx apostolica! petræ :* it may be said that in Rome the Apostle is ever present"1. To Leo was reserved the joy of seeing this *Citadel of Peter* recognised as such not only by ancient Rome and the whole of the West, but also by the bishop of the new Rome and all the oriental episcopate. Did not indeed the latter write to him at the end of the Council of Chalcedon2 3 that he had " received from the Lord himself the stewardship of the vineyard " and the task " of uniting the whole body of the Church " ? In after years it happened that the East forgot its recognition of Rome, but in so doing it belied its own judgment. Saint Leo himself would not have obtained so full an adherence had he not possessed such a noble conception of the divine nature of his mission and the rights it supposed. That, indeed, was the secret of his influence, and his true greatness.

CHAPTER XII.

Saint Leo's successors in the Papacy.

Special bibliography (for the whole of the chapter) 3.

Editions : A. Thiel, *Epistola Romanorum pontificum,* (annη. 461-523) Bamberg, 1868. Less careful edit, in *P. L.,* 58, sq.

Studies : L. Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis,* Paris, 1886, t. I. Jaffe, *Regesta Pontificum romanorum,* Berlin, 1851; 2nd edit. Leipsic 1855-1888 (2 vols). S. Lcevenfeld, *Epist. rom. ponti/, inedita,* Leipsic, 1885. H. Grisar, *Hist, de Rome et des Papes au M.-A.* (Fr. trans.) Paris, 1906.

1 P. Batiffol, *siège apostolique,* p. 431-432.
3 See above p. 129.
3 For each author in particular, see the notes.

I. S. GELASIUS (pope from 492 to 496)

Though his pontificate was but of short duration, Saint Gelasius was the most illustrious of Saint Leo's successors. He, and all the fifth century popes, have left to posterity a number of letters, many of which are in the form of decretals[2]. This was a style which developed considerably during the pontificates of Saint Innocent and Saint Leo.

A) Before Saint Gelasius.

Saint Hilarus[3], the deacon who was a member of the pontifical delegation at the Council of Ephesus (449) and who, when he had become pope, walked so admirably in the footsteps of St. Leo, left, in addition to two letters written previous to his pontificate, 11 letters or decretals[4], addressed to Spanish and Gallic bishops, and notably to Leontius, Archbishop of Arles (AA IV, vi, vu, ix, xn, in Thiel's edit.). He defended the latter's jurisdiction against the encroachments of the Archbishop of Vienne, and though he did not restore to him the primacy over all Gaul that had been taken from his predecessor[5], he entrusted him with various important missions. His correspondence with the East is not extant[6].

St. Simplicius (468-483) has left but 20 letters for all his fifteen years *of* pontificate[7]. They are for the most part addressed to Constantinople, 10 to the Emperor Zeno, and 5 to the Patriarch Acacius whom the pope in vain tried to restrain from falling into schism[8][9] He died shortly before the final revolt.

St. Felix III' (483-492) excommunicated Acacius and also those legates whom he had twice sent to Constantinople and who, corrupted by the patriarch, twice betrayed him. He was bravely supported,

[2] Editions : *P. L.* 59, 13-191. Thiel, *op. cit.,* p. 287-607. Studies : P. Godet, *Gilase I,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col 1179-1180. A. Roux, *Le Pape Gilase I* (492-496), Paris, 1880. B. VlANI, *I'itedei due pontefici S. Gelasio I e S. Anastasio II,* Modena, 18S0. C. Trezzini, *La legislazione canonica di papa S. Gelasio I,* Locamo, 1911. IL Leclercq, *Gélasien (Décret),* in *Diet. Arch.,* col. 722-747. F. Carrol, *Gélasien (Le sacramentaire), ibid.,* col 747-777. H. Grisar, *op. cit.,* π, p. 6-11. L. Saltet, *Pcv. hist, eccl.,* 1905 (t. vi), p. 516 sq., 748-749.

[3] See vol. I, p. 515 sq.

[3] E. Amann, 5. *Hilaire,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col 2385-2388.

[4] *P. L.,* 58, 1-32. Thiel, *op. cit.,* 126-174.

[5] See above p. 127 and below p. 165.

[6] We no longer possess the decretal that was sent to the Eastern bishops, confirming the three councils of Nicea, Ephesus, Chalcedon (the Council of Constantinople was recognised by Rome only after the peace of 519), the tome to Flavian, and the condemnation of Eutyches, Nestorius and other heretics. See *Liber Pontificalis, I,* p. 242.

[7] *P. L.*. 58, 35-62. Thiel, *op. cit.,* p. 6-9, 175-220.

[8] See above p- 62.

[9] See A. Cl erval, *Felix II* or *III* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 2130-2131.

however, by the Acoemitae. The schism of Acacius, opened by the fulmination of the excommunication in 484, lasted for 35 years. The 18 extant letters of this pope* deal for the most part with this conflict[1].

B) Saint Gelasius.

Saint Gelasius was a native of Africa and a faithful disciple of Saint Augustine. He was a pope of vigorous character, and wide intelligence. He displayed considerable activity both in the East and the West. He was a theologian and the first bishop of Rome to compose doctrinal treatises in the true sense of the term. To the government of the Church he brought prudence and strength. His considerable literary output is mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis?»* and by Gennadius of Marseilles or his continuator[4]. Considerable portions remain in treatises and letters and also perhaps in the so-called *Decree of Gelasius,* or the *Gelasian Sacramentary.*

The treatises of Saint Gelasius, which were for a long time mixed up with his letters, are six in numbers. Three of them deal with the schism of Acacius: one is a short historical memorandum on the development of Monophysitism until the schism of 4846; a third shows the necessity of erasing the names of Acacius and Peter Mongus from the Diptychs[7], while the third consists of an answer to Oriental objections regarding the excommunication of Acacius[8]. With these treatises may be classed the *De duabus naturis*[9], an explicit study of Christological teaching based on interesting Patristic documentation[10]. One of the last two treatises is a refutation of Pelagíanism", written before he became pope. The other was directed against the Pagan

[1] *P. L.,* 58, 893-973. *Corpus of Vienna,* 1895 (t. 35), p. 124-135, 14 letters. Thiel, *op. cit.,* p. 222-278.

[2] One of these letters deals with rebaptising and the conditions for reconciling the *lafsi* who had apostatised during the Vandal persecution.

[3] Edit. Duchesne, i, p. 255. — [4] *De virili.,* 94.

[5] Thiel classed these treatises separately in his edition.

[6] *Breviculus historiarum eutychianislarum* or *Gesta de Nomine Acacti: P. L.,* 58, 928-934. The author wrote 58 years after the appearance of Nestorianism. — [7] *De damnatione nominum retri et Aeacii; P. L.,* 59, 85-90.

[8] *Tomus de Anathematis vinculo; P. L.,* 59, 102-110.

[9] Missing in *P. L.* See Thiel, *op. cit.,* p. 53°'557.

[10] This is the Patristic documentation used by the anti-Cyrilh'ans at Ephesus in 431 and also by Theodoret when composing his *Eranisles.* See L. Saltet, *op. cit.* Since the pope was writing for Greek readers he drew on documents that he knew to be favourably considered in these circles.

[11] *Dicta adversus pelagianam haeresim; P. L.,* 59, 116-137.

senator Andromachus and other belated followers of the old worship, who were asking for the re-establishment of the *Lupercalia,* or licentious processions in honour of the gods[1].

Saint Gelasius' extant letters[2] are relatively numerous, considering the short duration of his pontificate. They numbered 43 in addition to some fifty fragments, until the discovery, in 1885, of 22 notes[3] "of elegant and concise style" which must be attributed to him. The latter deal chiefly with ecclesiastical discipline, while in the former the pope deals with difficulties arising throughout the whole Church. In the *West,* Theodoric had ascended the imperial throne in 493 and although he was relatively tolerant of the Catholics he nevertheless stood out as the champion of Arianism[4]. The pope had also to clean up all lingering traces of Manichaeism[5] and Pelagianism[6][7]and see that religion was restored in those regions of Italy that had been devastated by the war[7]. He was confronted with graver difficulties in the East where the schism of Acacius had broken out and was prolonged by the twofold complicity of the patriarch and the emperor[8]. Since in reality it was not so much the Christological doctrine that was in question as the very authority of Rome, Gelasius was not afraid to follow Leo's example and insist on this latter point.

The Apostolic See is infallible in its confession of faith which "cannot be tainted by any false doctrine or contact with any error; should such a misfortune befall us in our own belief, and we are firmly confident that such is impossible, how could we hope to face up to any alien error? Where could we look for the correction of the errors of others?[9]"

1 *Adversus Andromacham: P. L.,* 59, no-116. See Grisar, *op. cit.,* II, p. 9.

2 *P. L.,* 59, 13-190. Thiel, *op. cit.*

3 J. Loewenfeld, *Epistola pontificum romanorum inedita,* Leipsic, 1885, p. 1-12.

4 Grisar, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 8.

5 See *Liber Pontif.*

6 As regards the question of grace and predestination, he professed a moderate Augustinism. *Epist.* vil.

7 Letter to the bishops of Lucania (very important decretal).

8 The emperor Anastasius, Zeno's successor (491-518) maintained the Henoticon in spite of the pope's instances, and the Patriarch *Euphemius* (490-496) who lud openly approved the Council of Chalcedon and desired union with Rome (he restored the name of the pope to the Diptychs), refused to erase the name of Acacius from these same Diptychs: Gelasius resisted these half-hearted measures. Moreover, the emperor, finding that Euphemius held too moderate views, deposed him in 496.

9 *Epist.* Vili *(Ad Anast.); P. L.,* 59, 43-44.

The authority of this Apostolic See is *founded on Peter* and in no way on political power. Therefore Gelasius complains of the ambitions of Constantinople, which, because it is a capital city, would have the first place after Rome in the East: Ravenna, Milan, Trier, Sirmium have all been imperial residences, yet their bishops have never been raised up to the detriment of others [1]. Finally the pope had no intention of denying the part played by the civil power which remains truly distinct from the spiritual power, although the latter extends even to kings [2].

These views of Saint Gelasius are found to be fairly well reproduced in the famous G-elasian Decree[3]. The attribution of this document to Gelasius, which has again been made recently by serious critics [4] would seem, at first sight, to be well founded. Even the adversaries of this attribution recognise that the idea animating the whole document is the principle of authority[5] envisaged in all the forms it takes in Christian eyes, and which are dealt with by the author in 5 chapters in descending order: I. Christ and the Holy Ghost; II. the Scriptures; in. the Roman Church and the privileged sees that are attached to it; IV. the orthodox councils and doctors; v. apocryphal authors having no official authority. The document was composed by one man who probably made use of previous works in writing the first and second chapters and also in all probability, the third [6]. As for the last chapters it is thought that he composed them himself according to the principles which guided him in adapting the first three. It is not of course impossible that Gelasius was the author of this document; this opinion, however, is hardly probable, since several features of the work seem to exclude the hypothesis of its being an official Roman document[7]. Consequently it would seem that the Decree originated elsewhere than in Rome, either in Italy or in Gaul and that it was very probably composed at the beginning of the sixth century. It must have been a private document reproducing the teaching and uses then current in the West and even in Rome. The author was particularly interested in knowing and following the customs of the latter see[8].

[1] *Ad Episc. Dardania, P. L.,* 59, 82.

[2] *Epist.* vili *(Ad Anast.), P. L.,* 59, 42.

[3] See vol. 1, p. 514.

[4] Chiefly Doni Chapman *(Rev. bin.,* 1913), against M. Dobschutz, *(Texte u. Uni.,* 1912.

[5] See H. Leclercq, *op. cit.,* 736.

[6] Mgr Batiffol does not think that Chap, in should be ascribed to Damasus. *U Siège apost.,* p. 149. See vol. 1, p. 304.

[7] In chap, iv (n. 4) the author says: It is done in this manner in various Churches; they do otherwise in Rome as we know: we will therefore follow the Roman use. This reasoning supposes a writer not living in Rome. Further the silence of Dionysius the Less and even that of Cassiodorus leads to the same conclusion. See H. Leclercq, *op.* «7., 739-740.

[8] See the text of the Decree scientifically re-established by Dobschutz in II. Leclercq, *op. cit.,* 740-745·

Early authors attributed a liturgical work to Saint Gelasius but it is not easy for us to judge of its nature. His homilies on biblical and liturgical subjects as well as his hymns are lost. There is extant, bearing bis name, a *sacramentar)',* i. e., an early liturgical book containing chiefly the prayers of the Mass recited by the priest (with the exception of the parts sung by the choir, the deacon and the subdeacon) and other prayers and ceremonies now found in the ritual or pontifical. It is agreed that the Gelasian Sacramentary occupies a middle place between the *Leonian* and *Gregorian* sacramentarles and that it is of Roman origin. Apart from that, opinions are sharply divided. Mgr Duchesne thinks it was composed between 621-731, therefore after St. Gregory. To this many critics oppose the thesis of the critics of the xvii-xvm century (Tommasi, Muratori, Martène) and maintain that it was written in the fifth century and that it is essentially Saint Gelasius' work, although it may have undergone certain additions or modifications in the course of the centuries Whatever may be the case, the work is worthy of this great pope.

II. SAINT HORMISDAS (pope from 514-523)[1]

Pope Hormisdas is chiefly famous for his pacification of the Churches and his destruction of the schism of Acacius which was attended by remarkable circumstances. Neither Saint Gelasius nor the two following popes had had any degree of success in this matter.

Anastasias II[3] (496-498) although strongly inclined to conciliation, had not the time to begin negotiations[4][5] with the emperor Anastasius (491-518) who moreover had taken the initiative. This prince hesitated between the Monophysites whom he treated with favour and who were increasing in strength, thanks to the peace achieved by the Henoticon, and the Catholics whose sense of tradition turned them towards the Apostolic See, the centre of unity. But he was anxious to continue the policy that Zeno had inaugurated[5].

Symmachus[6] the successor of Anastasius II, from 498 to 514, adopted a very firm attitude in his dealings with the Byzantines ; the emperor retaliated with systematic hostility and even went so far as to publish defamatory pamphlets which the pope was obliged to refute *{Ep.* X).

1 See Dom F. Cabrol, *op. cit.,* col. 771-774.

a Editions: *P. L.,* 63. 367 sq. Thiel, *op. cit.,* 733-1006. Studies: E. Amann, *Hormisdas,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 161-176. S. Salaville, *Hénotique, ibid.,* col. 2172-2178.

3 A few of his letters are extant: Thiel, *op. cit.,* 615-639. We must mention letter VI (to the bishops of Gaul', condemning Generatianism : this is the first official document on the matter. Cf. Grisar, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 54. The fine letter to Clovis from this pope isa forgery, Vignier's work. See *ibid.* Cf. vol I, p. 13. **1**

4 The *Liber Pontificalis* exaggerates, but gives the popular opinion when it says of Anastasius : " Voluit occulte revocare Aeacium et non potuit; qui divino nutu percussus est". T. I., p. 258.

5 See above, p. 60. — 6 See H. Grisar, *op. cit.,* p. 12-33.

Furthermore the Greek emperor had opposed his election by favouring the candidature of the priest Laurence who was consecrated bishop (anti-pope), but not obtaining Theodoric's consent, shortly afterwards submitted and accepted a provincial diocese. His partisans nevertheless kept up their opposition to Symmachus and even resorted to violence as well as calumny. The *Palmary Synod* (402)[1] convoked with Theodoric's consent for the purpose of judging him, evaded the issue by declaring: *Summa sedes a neminejudicatur.* There are extant some ten *letters* of this troubled pontificate[2] during which the division between the West and the East seemed to be widened. Nevertheless union was on its way and needed but Hormisdas to effect it.

As a deacon, Hormisdas had always been faithful to Symmachus, When he became pope on the 20th July 514, he continued the latter's firm policy, but with such diplomacy that he succeeded in giving peace tothe Church. His negotiations with Byzantium opened after the end of the year 514. The emperor took the initiative for he was coerced by public opinion, uneasy about the rapid progress of Monophysitism and supported by General Vitalian's army[3]. It was Anastasius' plan to put an end to the troubles in a council at Heraclea on the Marmora, at which he hoped the pope himself would assist. Several Roman legations went to Constantinople headed by Ennodius of Pavia and resulted only in reviving in a number of bishops the desire foi reunion with Rome. The emperor consistently refused to accept the conditions set out by the pope. With his death (9th April 518) the schism lost its chief supporter[4] and soon disappeared.

Justin 1 (518-527) who succeeded Anastasius was an ardent Catholic, determined to achieve the triumph of the orthodox faith of Chalcedon by submitting to the Apostolic See. In this resolve he was seconded by his nephew, the Count Justinian[5], who, enjoyed great influence at the time, and also by General Vitaban whom he summoned to Constantinople. The emperor restored the exiled Catholic bishops to their sees, expelled the Monophysites, and exacted an explicit subscription to the Council of Chalcedon. Finally,

[1] The *Synodus Patinai is* is thus called either because of the place where it was held (a part of the Roman Forum according to some, or the Atrium of St. Peter's according to others) or because of the unanswerable and peremptory nature of its decision.

[2] *P. I..,* 62, 40-80. Thiel, *op. cit.y* 641-738. Various documents calculated to defend the pope against his adversaries were published under Symmachus by an anonymous writer devoted to his cause. These were the apocryphal historical documents: *Acts of Pope Liberius; Acts of Pope Marctllinus; Purification of Pope Sixtus III; Polychronius ofJerusalem; Constitutum Silvestri* (Collection of 20 ordinances). See II. Grisar, ii, p. 14 and 281-285.

[3] He led an army of 50. 000 men to the walls of Constantinople, and called for a return to the faith of Chalcedon.

[4] He had sent into exile the patriarch Euphemius (490-496) and also his successor Macedonius (496-511) whom he found lacking in enthusiasm for the Henoticon.

[5] See above p. 79 sq.

after having settled the serious question of the anathema against Acacius he made overtures to Rome with a view to the restoration of unity. With the coming of the new sovereign, the patriarch John II bowed to public opinion, and declared himself to be irreproachably orthodox He joined with Justin and Justinian in demanding the pope's intervention. Hormisdas imposed two conditions : although Acacius and his two successors had not been formal heretics, they had separated themselves from communion with Rome and their names were therefore to be *erasedfrom the Diptychs;* secondly, a very explicit *doctrinalformulary* on Christological teaching and the authority of the Apostolic See, which was sent by the pope, was to be signed. Both conditions were accepted although not without heartburning in certain quarters. As regards the former, the fact that Acacius' two successors had been deposed by Anastasius had rendered them very popular2; but the pope had too many reasons to mistrust those bishops who, otherwise orthodox, truckled to error by failing to condemn its authors (i. e., Acacius' partisans). The second was rejected by a number of prelates, in particular by the Archbishop of Thessalonica 3. The Patriarch of Constantinople, although he added to the Formula of Hormisdas a somewhat ambiguous prologue in the form of a letter 4, signed it all the same. His example was followed by the majority of the episcopate of the Empires, with the exception of Syria and Egypt where, owing to the Henoticon, the Monophysite opposition had become threatening. The

1 On the 15th and 16th July 518 manifestations were held in Constantinople, even in the Cathedral itself, in order to obtain the condemnation of the heretics and the restoration to the Diptychs of the names of the pope and of the two patriarchs whom Anastasias had banished. See above p. 147.

a Even the Catholics venerated them for this reason.

3 He even set an ambush for one of the legates, who was wounded. The emperor banished him, but only for a short time.

4 Wherein the patriarch says : " Sanctissimas enim Dei ecclesias, id est superioris vestræ et novellæ istius Romæ, unam esse accipio illam sedem apostoli Petri et augustæ civitatis unam esse definio ", Did he mean by this to associate the See of Constantinople in the privileges of the See of Peter? That is possible; but this insinuation was evidently contradicted and annulled by the document as a whole, as well as by all contemporary facts. It would seem that John desired only to attenuate the form of his submission to an authority, that of Peter, which he knew very well to be legitimate. In this same letter John II associated with the Councils of Nicea (325), Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451), that of Constantinople (381) which Rome then accepted, at least as regards its dogmatic declarations.

5 According to Dollinger, 2,500 bishops signed the pontifical formulary.

Formula of Hormisdas contained nothing new; but it set out traditional doctrine with remarkable concision.

The Formula of Hormisdas, in addition to the introduction, contains a double profession of faith regarding the Christological question and the authority of the Apostolic See. The *introduction* embodies two principles of orthodoxy: the "constituta Patrum" and the guidance of the Apostolic See in which "the Catholic religion has ever been preserved without blemish". Founded on this double authority the formulary contains an explicit condemnation of all those who have erred in *Christological teaching,* from Nestorius to Peter (Mongus) of Alexandria, Acacius of Constantinople and Peter (Fullo) of Antioch. Further, it expresses the acceptation of the "letters written by the blessed pope Leo on the Christian religion", and future docility with regard to the *See of Peter :* "Sequentes in omnibus apostolicam sedem et prædicantes eius omnia constituta"; for such is the gage of Catholic unity : "Et ideo spero, ut in una communione vobiscum, quam sedes apostolica prædicat, esse merear, in qua est integra et verax christianæ religionis et perfecta soliditas The document ends with a promise of loyalty, confirmed by the signature of each bishop \

It is remarkable that such a document should mark the opening of the truly Byzantine period[2] of the Greek Church. The subscription of such a large number of bishops was of course chiefly due to imperial influence. Yet that is precisely one of the most characteristic features of that Church. In reality, save for the exchange of letters of enthronization, even the four patriarchs had but few direct relations with Rome. The union depended above all on the emperor, aided by the *Permanent Synod,* which, as a rule, was wholly devoted to him: a result of this was that Rome usually dealt directly with the emperor even in religious matters, through the medium of her *apocrisarii*[3]\ This situation would certainly have ended by subjecting the Church to the State, had there not existed the higher and purely religious authority of the successor of Peter, recognised as such by Justin, Justinian and a great number of their successors. It nevertheless constituted an extremely dangerous state oí affairs since it had the tendency of subordinating the interests of religion to those of the prince.

These drawbacks were felt acutely by the most ardent among the Christians, especially by the monks and in particular by lhe *Acantitez* at the beginning of the vith century; by Saint Maximus and his monks in the vilth century, and in the VUIth century by Saint Theodore and

1 Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion,* n. 171-172. Sec above, p. 63.

2 See above, p. 4.

3 See above, p. 131.

his studites who saw in Roman intervention a counterbalance to State control. The majority of Oriental Christians, however, adapted themselves to a less strict Catholicism and never dreamed *of* having recourse to Rome, save in very exceptional circumstances. Many indeed were quite willing to do without Rome altogether. This radical nationalist movement which ended in triumph after the XIth century, had but few protagonists as yet* but it found its model in Acacius and its incentive in his work'. *Hormisdas* was unable to destroy wholly the evil done by the schism, not because his efforts were inopportune or insufficient, but because he lacked support. The group of which we have just spoken, a kind of centre party[3], which was by far the most numerous in Byzantium, instead of profiting by the lessons given by Rome in the name of tradition, paid far too much heed to those who excited its mistrust in the Apostolic See. It must be said of Hormisdas that he clearly and forcefully showed the path that must be followed. The same unfortunately cannot be said *of* some of those who succeeded him.

Hormisdas' work to secure an understanding is best known to us through his correspondence. Some 80 of his letters are extant[4], of which a great many were sent to the East in an endeavour to settle the question of union, or to discuss the Theopaschite formulary[5] which the Scythian monks had proposed with a view to conciliation. Others addressed to Western Churches, and especially to Spanish bishops, are important from a canonical viewpoint, for they deal with the ordinations of clergy, episcopal elections, or regularity in the holding of provincial councils[6]. Before his death in 523 Saint Hormisdas had the consolation of seeing the end of the Vandal persecution and the re-establishrnent of the Catholic hierarchy authorised by Trasimond's successor[7]. He had been, says E. Amann[8,9] a distinguished administrator and a strong and clever diplomat. "He is to be numbered among those pontiffs who have the most successfully vindicated" the full religious supremacy of the Apostolic See.

III. VIGILIUS (537-555) and PELAGIUS (556-561)'.

These popes are best dealt with together, although the pontificate of Pelagius does not strictly come within the period now in question.

* On this movement, see S. Salaville, *Hénotique,* in *Did. thiol.·,* col. 2164 sq.

' It is obviously a mistake to regard Acacius and his imitators as the spokesmen of the whole Greek Church in the fifth and following centuries. They represented but a minor fraction of that Church.

3 It was of course not so much an organised party as a movement.

4 *P. L.,* 63, 367-533. Thiel, *op. cit.,* p. 739-1006. — 5 See above, p. 73.

6 *Epist.,* 24-26. A letter from Hormisdas to St. Remy of Rheims, charging the latter with the interest of all the Churches in the Frankish kingdom would seem to be apocryphal. 7 See below, p. 195.

b Diet, thiol., art. *Hormisdas,* col. 176. <5

9 Studies: H. Grisar. *op. cit.,* 11, p. 50, sq. 132-155. Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist, des Conciles,* li (2nd Pt.) p. 1175-1181 (notes), in (1st Pt.), p. 1-140. I hese authors make a discreet use of Mgr Duchesne's extremely critical study, *et Ptìage,* in *Rev. quest, hist.,* 1884 (t. 36), p. 36959. See also 1885 (Dom Chamard; Duchesne). On F. Savio, *Il papa Vigilio (Civiltà cattolica,* 1904), Cf. *Revue August.,* 1904 (1. 4). p. S4-89.

We possess but few letters of the six popes ' who, within the space of 14 years succeeded Hormisdas on the throne of Peter with a rapidity which is explained either by their advanced age or the persecution to which they were subjected. Some, however, were responsible for important documents. In particular may be mentioned the approval of the council of Orange by Boniface IIa; and the indirect approval of the Theopaschite formula by John II3. Like Saint JOHN I in 525, the pope Saint Agapitus went in 536 to Constantinople on a diplomatic mission in the name of the king of the Italian Goths, and like John he also received a triumphant welcome. While there, he showed his authority by deposing Anthimus the Monophysite patriarch recently named by Theodora, and by consecrating Mennas on the 13th March 536. He died in Constantinople during the following month4 5 His successor Saint Silverus offended Theodora by his refusal to restore Anthimus and was deported in 537 to an island, where he died in 538 or 540 as a result of harsh treatment. From 537 *Vigilius* had been named as his successor and became the lawful pope on the death of Silverus.

Vig'ilius a Roman of Senatorial family and son of a consul was chosen, while yet a deacon, by Boniface II as his successor. This choice however was not maintained. As apocrisarius at Constantinople he found favour with Theodora who, in 537, had him named pope in place of Saint Silverus. It may be wondered whether he was guilty of shameful compromise in this matter. Such may be the case although the formal accusations made by his enemies have never been definitely proved. But if Theodora had hoped to find in him a defender of Monophysitism, she was deceived. Vigilius is chiefly famous for the part he took in the controversy of the Three Chapters 5. To him are due three famous extant documents concerning this matter: the *Judicatum* (nth April 548); the *Constitutum* in favour of the Three Chapters (14th May 553); and a second *Constitutum* against the same Three Chapters (23rd February 554) 6. The difficulties which are raised from a theological point of view by Vigilius' contradictory attitude in the various phases of the affair may be cleared up chiefly by the very object of the controversy, which at bottom was really a question

› St John I (523-527); St. Felix IV (526-530); Boniface II (530-532); John II (533'535); St. Agapitus I (535'536); St. Silverus (536'538).

3 See below, p. 204. Letters of Felix and Boniface in *P. L.,* 65, 9-23, 29-51.

3 See Denzinger B., *Enchiridion,* n. 201-202. Letters: *P. L.,* 66, 9-31.

4 7 extant letters: Mansi, *Cone.,* Vili, 845-860; *P. L.,* 66, 3I-79.

5 He also approved the condemnation of Origenism. See above, p. 82, and vol. 1, p. 219.

6 See *P. L.,* 69, 67 sq. For the controversy as a whole, see above, p. 83-87.

of opportunityL From a moral viewpoint the pope's responsibility for the successive concessions which the imperial will forced on his weak character, is lessened in part by his well-founded fear of schism. Greatly weakened by all the trials of his long stay in the East, Vigilius died in Sicily while returning to Rome in 555 2

Pelagius I, also descended from a great Roman family, succeeded him in 556. For twenty years, from 536, he was apocrisarius at Constantinople. During Vigilius' stay in the East he acquired great influence in Rome. He returned to Byzantium for the council and supported the pope in his opposition to the emperor. As nuncio Pelagius found favour with Justinian and even with Theodora. Of strong character, bold in conception and a finished diplomat, he was greatly to the fore in Constantinople.

The attitude he took in the controversy of the Three Chapters earned him the emperor's enmity and in consequence he was shut up in a monastery at the end of 553. When Vigilius had accepted the council Pelagius wrote two treatises3 against him (554-555)· Nothing is known of the immediate outcome. But it is a fact that on the 16th April 556, supported by the emperor, he was called to succeed Vigilius (the See having been vacant for six months) and in his turn approved the council of 553 and the condemnation of the Three Chapters. " It has been said that this change in him could only have been due to the bait of the Papal dignity. That is possible, but not at all certain", says Grisar4. Other and nobler motives must have had their part. If he did indeed have a moment *of* weakness, the fact that he showed himself great while yet a deacon and that nothing besmirched his pontificate5 makes it all the more regrettable.

He succeeded in pacifying the Western Church 6, and brought about a complete understanding with the new sovereign of Italy, the emperor of Byzantium. He was a splendid administrator 7. His letters reveal him correcting the shortcomings of the clergy and interesting himself in

x See above, p. 83.

a 15 of his letters are extant (/< £., 69, 15-178), several of which are important as regards the above controversy.

3 As yet unedited: *Refutatorium ad fafatn Vigilium,* and *Libri VI iti defensionem capitulorum.*

4 IL Grisar, *op. cit.,* π, p. 139.

5 See *ibid., op. cit.,* p. 140-142.

Ibid., 142-144. He succeeded in putting an end to the schism produced by the Council of 553. in Illyria, in Africa and in nearly the whole of Italy. His successors, chiefly Pelagius n (570*590), also applied themselves zealously to this task.

7 H. Grisar, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 153, sq.

their education x. His epitaph speaks of his great charity and his efforts to relieve all manner of hardships.

IV. APPENDIX TO THE QUESTION OF THE THREE CHAPTERS. THEIR AFRICAN PARTISANS'.

Facundus, Bishop of Hermianc[illegible], in Byzacena, was one of the most vigorous opponents of Justinian's policy in the affair of the Three Chapters. To his mind the whole controversy was dominated by "two guiding principles; that of the emperor's doctrinal incompetence, and to a greater extent, that of the fatal blow dealt to the authority of the Council of Chalcedon to the advantage of Monophysitism At bottom he was right, though as regards the second point he magnified the danger. He was at Constantinople even before the pope's arrival and had already presented a memorandum in favour of the Three Chapters. In 547 or 548 he gave fuller expression to his ideas in the episcopal commission set up by Vigilius and called attention to himself by the vigour and clarity of his explanations. On the appearance of the *Judicatum* he sided against the pope. Two years later he published his great work in 12 books, *Pro defensione trium capitulorum*4. It caused a great stir. In spite of its somewhat libellous style and many rash assertions, the work still spared Vigilius. After 553, however, Facundus changed his tone. He broke violently with the pope and nothing would change him. In 564 he was shut up in a monastery at Constantinople. He died in the schism about 571. Shortly before his death he composed a bitter and virulent writing in which he pilloried the tyranny of the imperial government in religious affairs5, while in another and final writing he endeavoured to show that the schism of the Three Chapters gave rise neither to divergencies of faith nor liturgy.

The following African polemists were only a little less ardent in defending the Three Chapters.

1. **Verecundus of Junca,** in Byzacena (d. 552), poet and exegete also compiled *Extracts from the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* 6.

2. **Primasius of Hadrumetum,** (d. before 567) was a vigorous protagonist of the Three Chapters but left no writing on the question 7.

' Fifteen are extant, *P. L.*, 69, 393-422, in addition to a few notes recently discovered. Loewenfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 12-21.

3 In the West the defenders of the Three Chapters were found chiefly in Africa. See H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne,* ii, 25S sq. We must also mention Rusticus, a Roman deacon and Vigilius' nephew, whom the latter excommunicated. Rusticus' controversial work *Disputatio contra Acéchalos* is extant, *P. L., (>t,* 1167-1254.

3 Hurter, *Nomenclat. litter.,* 1, n. 291. P. Godet, *Diet, théol.,* art. *Facundus,* col. 2066-2067. — 4 *P. L., &],* 527-852.

5 *P. L.,* 67, 867-878 *(Epistola catholica fidei in defensione trium capitulorum).*

6 Edited by Pitra *(Spicii, solesm.,* iv), with his nine books of *Commentary* on the Canticle, and his *poem* on penance.

7 His only extant work is a *Commentary on the Apocalypse* (compilation). *P. L.,* 68, 793-936· He is not the author of the Comm, on St. Paul *(Ibid.,* 413*794)·

3. **Junilius**, a devout layman living at Constantinople and holding the position *of* "quæstor sacri palatii", left only some *Instituta* which form a very clear introduction to the study of Sacred Scripture[1].

4. **Liberatus**, a deacon *of* Carthage, wrote an abridged history of the controversies from 428 to 553[2]. He was biased in favour of the Three Chapters, but his work, in spite of its poor style, is of great historical interest.

CHAPTER XIII.

Orators.

Special bibliography : see the note for each author.

SAINT PETER CHRYSOLOGUS[3].

Saint Peter Chrysologus (406-450 circa) about the year 433 became Bishop of Ravenna, which, at that time was the residence of the imperial court. The little that is known of his life is found in his oratorical works and a letter (preserved among those of St. Leo, *Ep.* 25)[4] that he wrote to Eutyches when the latter, having been condemned by Flavian, implored his protection. With wisdom and moderation he urged him to submit to the counsel of the Bishop of Rome who alone was competent in the matter Quoniam beatus Petrus *qui in propria sede vivit et præsidet,* præstat quærentibus fidei veritatem ; nos enim, pro studio pacis et fidei, *extra consensum Romance civitatis episcopi,* causas fidei audire non possumus

There are extant 176 sermons[5] bearing the name of Peter Chrysologus, brought together by Felix, Bishop of Ravenna from 708 to 717. Possibly some of these are not authentic, but, on the other hand, there must be a certain

1 *P. L·,* 68, 15-42 (entitled : *De partibus divina legis}.*

2 *P. L..* 68. 969-1052 *{Breviariurn causa nestorianorum et eutychianorum}.*

3 Edition : *P. L.,* 52 (edit. Venice, 1750). Studies : various dissertations in *P. L.,* 52, 79-183. *Vita : ibid.,* 14 sq. *In German:* general studies, H. Dapper, Cologne 1867; Stablewski, Posen, 1871; the homiletic writer, Peters, Cologne, 1919: the preacher, Bohmer, Paderborn, 1919.

4 *P. ¿.,*54, 739-744-

number not yet edited or attributed to other orators 1. At least half of these discourses have a *Biblical subject* as their theme : the author sets himself out to perfect the research for the literal sense by that of a spiritual sense : " Quia historica relatio ad altiorein semper est intelligentiam sublimanda"2. Several treat of *dogmatic* subjects and especially of the Incarnation. Sermons 56-62 are a commentary on the *Apostles Creed.* There is also a series of panegyrics of the *Blessed Virgin* and another of Saint John the Baptist. All these sermons, although generally very short, are the work of a true orator. They are composed with winning eloquence and the lively and colourful style is excellently adapted both to the expression of clear and practical thought vigorously phrased and the emphasis of clever antitheses 3. These writings had a great vogue in the Middle Ages. The popular title *Chrysologus* is first found applied to the Bishop of Ravenna in a ninth century writing, but probably goes back to the time of the orator. Saint Peter Chrysologus was declared *Doctor* by Benedict XIII in 1729.

II. SAINT MAXIMUS OF TURIN*

Saint Maximus, Bishop of Turin in the Vth century is, together with Saint Augustine, one of the early Latin Fathers who has left to posterity one of the finest collections of sermons. But for them, indeed, he would scarce be known. From other sources we know only that he assisted at a council at Milan and subscribed to its acts in 451, and a Roman council in 465, in the report of whose proceedings his name immediately follows that of the pope (probably as senior bishop). But his discourses show him to have been a bishop ardent in the fight against Paganism and heresy, and zealous for the moral advancement of his flock. His

/See Λ 52, 183, concerning the 7 sermons in the appendix : *P. L., 52,* 665-680. Dorn de Bruyne admits the authenticity of a series of 18 sermons, of which half were published by Mai. Cf. *Journal of Theological Studies,* 1928, p. 362-368. See Baxter's study on the internal criticism of Chrysologus' sermons, *ibidem,* 1920-1921, 250-258.

2 *Setm.* 36.

3 Qui iocari voluerit cum diabolo, non poterit gaudere cum Christo. *Serm. 155.*

* Edition: *P. L.,* 57, (Ed. Bruni, Rome, 7148). Studies: C. Ferreri, *S. Massimo di T.* Torino, 1858 (vin-168 pp.). F. Savio, *Antichi vesc.,* Torino, 1889 (p. 5-I7)· S. Colombo, *Per una edizione critica delle opere di* 5. *Massino di T.,* in the Didascaleion, 1924, p. 71-75. C. Callewaert, in *Rev. bén.,* 1920, p. 130-144 (on Lent).

works have been somewhat arbitrarily classed as HOMILIES (i 18 : *De tempore, De sanctis, De diversis),* SERMONS (ιτὸ: *De tempore, De sanctis, De diversis),* TRACTATUS (5) and explanations (23 *expositiones de capitulis Evangeliorum* [1], which form the tractatus 6)[2]. As an appendix the editor has added as doubtful or apocryphal 31 sermons, 3 homilies and 2 letters 3; to these should probably be added several of the writings from the preceding class. Nevertheless the work as a whole appears to be authentic. These discourses which in their brevity resemble those of St. Leo or St. Peter Chrysologus are models of simple eloquence, lively and strong, animated by an undoubted pastoral zeal.

III. — SAINT ENNODIUS OF PAVIA (473-521)*.

Magnus Felix Ennodius sprang from a Gallic family, probably natives of Arles. While still young he lost both his parents. He then made his home in Italy where he entered on a brilliant career by making a fortunate marriage and attracting great attention as a poet and master of rhetoric. But he allowed himself to slip into a very worldly mode of life. A serious illness worked in him a change and about 493 he entered the ranks of the clergy while his wife became a nun 5. Without altogether giving up his interest in rhetoric and secular studies, he gave himself sincerely to the Church, which he first served as a deacon at Pavia. He was present with his bishop in 502 at the famous Roman synod *(Synodus Palmaris)* which refused to judge Pope Symmachus6: later he undertook the latter's defence in a *Libellus* which was read and approved in a fresh Roman

1 Dom B. Capelle has shown that these Expositiones form a part of an Arian collection and are the work of the Arian bishop Maximinus in the IVth cent. See *Rev. b¿n.,* 1922, Si-108. He has edited 24 in the same revue, 1928, 49-86.

3 Bruni's edit., in *P. L.,* 221-832.

3 *P. ¿.,* 57, 843-958.

4 Edition: *P. L.,* 63, (Sirmond's edit., Paris, 1611). G. Hartel, in *Corpus* of Vienna, 1882, t. vi. Fr. Vogel, in *Mon. ger. hist.,* Berlin, 1885, t. vu. Studies: In addition to Hartel's and \rogel's introductions, see St. Legi.ise, in the *Université cath.,* 1889-1890, t. 11, in, iv (on the Roman Primacy), 1890, t. v (on Education). F. Magani, *Ennodio,* Pavia, 1886. A. Dubois, *La latinité Ennodius,* Paris, 1903. P. Godet, *Ennodius,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 126-129.

lie himself had told of his backslidings in the form of Confessions in the *Etuharislicuni de vita sua, P. I...* 63, 24Ç-2ÇO.

6 See above, p. 146.

synod held in 503 x. He became Bishop of Pavia in 510 or 511 and administered his diocese with truly pastoral sollicitude. Saint Hormisdas twice sent him on a mission to Constantinople, in 515 and 517. Both failed owing to the ill-will of the emperor[2]. He died in 521 and was honoured as a saint.

What remains of his literary work shows that the Christian labours of the bishop did not make him altogether forget his early studies of Pagan humanities and culture. Traces are to be found in every class of his writings : letters, opuscula, discourses and poetry.

The 297 letters[3] which compose his correspondence before he became bishop are of great historic interest, but very few treat of religious subjects.

The 10 opuscula[4], on the contrary, are almost wholly religious in character: in this class are included the little *autobiography* already mentioned (*op.* v), as well as the *memorandum* in favour of the council of 502 (*op.* II)[5]; *two lives of saints* (St. Epiphanius of Pavia and St. Antony of Lerins, *op.* IV); a *Paraenesis didascalica,* i. e., a little manual of pedagogy according to the principles of Ennodius (*op.* vi) and two formulas for the solemn *blessing* of the Paschal Candle (*of.* IX, x). The panegyric of Theodoric (*op.* 1) with which the series opens was composed in 507, probably on the occasion of some political festivity: it is both a valuable historical source and a work of art in which the qualities and defects of a whole generation are vividly portrayed[6].

The discourses *{dictiones)* to the number of 28[7], treat for the most part of secular matter[8]: the first 6 alone are devoted to Christian subjects, and even here, as in the remainder of this oratorical work, there is a great display of pure rhetoric.

Ennodius' poetry fills two books[9] each containing a number of religious pieces : a panegyric of St. Epiphanius, hymns to the Blessed Virgin and the saints (twelve, not adopted in the liturgy), inscriptions for Churches and statues, and eulogies of bishops. All the remainder

[1] *Libellus apologéticas pro synodo quarta romana. P. L.,* 63, 1S3-207. See L. Duchesne in *Revue de philologie.* 1883, 78-81.

a See p. 146.

3 *P. L..* 63, 13-168. These letters have been classed in nine books.

4 *Ibid.,* 176-262.

5 See above.

6 *P. L.,* 63, 176-184. See C. Cipolla, *Intorno al panegirico de re Teodorico,* Padua, 1889 (18 pp.).

"/<¿.,63,263-309.

8 There are 7 scholastic allocutions *(scholastica dtclis)* for special occasions, 10 dissertations *(controversia)* on set subjects and 5 discourses on Pagan Ethics *(ethica dictis).*

[9] *P. L.,* 63, 309-334 (Bk. I : short poems, hymns); 333-362 (Bk. Il : 151 epigrams, epitaphs).

is secular; some of the epigrams are almost licentious in tone. The poetic inspiration is weak.

"Rhetor and bishop, poet, or rather poetaster, and writer of prose, Ennodius who was one of the most distinguished men of letters in the time of Theodoric, was also an impassioned lover of the old Pagan rhetoric. He had an ingenuous and whole-hearted admiration for its methods, its conceits and its generally bizarre, if not worse, themes. He considered such a system of education necessary for everyone, even priests; and to his mind it were sacrilege to attempt its reform. It is therefore not surprising that in every page of Ennodius' work and verse is found the language and fancy of Paganism; but though the subjects which the author delights to treat, those that were taught in the schools, are often borrowed from the ancient worship; though allusions to legend and mythological heros abound... nevertheless underneath this tawdry glitter, this mythological finery which disfigures Ennodius' work, the Christian and the son of the Church peeps through"[1]. However, it is easy to see what a gap separates him, for instance, from Saint Leo, Saint Peter Chrysologus and Saint Maximus.

From the point of view of doctrine he had little authority, though a few points are worth mentioning: I. He pointed out the perils of Monophysitism *(Diet.* IV) and came to grips with this heresy during his two legations at Constantinople. 2. He worked for the unity of the Church by means of the extirpation of Acacius' schism. 3. He was a loyal defender of the pontifical primacy, even going as far as to attribute a kind of impeccability to the successors of Peter[2]. 4. As regards teaching on Grace he seems to have followed Cassian and Faustus rather than Saint Augustine[3]. His humanities made him naturally prone to Semipelagian tendencies[4].

1 P. Godet, *op. cit.,* col. 127-128.

8 Which is of course exaggerated and false, though Ennodius did not mean that no unworthy person might ascend the pontifical throne or that a true pope could commit no sin. Cf. II. Grisar, *Hist, de Rome et des Papes,* II, p. 30-31.

3 On the one hand he thought man incapable of advancing in virtue without the help of grace, but on the other hand he thought man could make, of his own power, the first steps in grace. P. Godet, *op. cit.,* 12S.

4 According to letter iv, 8, loans at interest were considered lawful at the beginning of the vith cent.

IV. — SALVIANUS[1] (vth cent.).

The nature of Salvianus' work permits him to be classed with the orators rather than with the historians or the theologians. He was born of Christian parents at the end of the fourth century in Rhenish Gaul (Cologne-Trier) where he was brought up. He married Palladia, a young Pagan, whom he converted together with her parents. From that time forth the two young people lived in continence, as we are told in the affectionate letter in which Salvianus explains his behaviour to the father and mother of Palladia who were aghast at such a resolve. When the Franks crossed the Rhine, he retired to the South of Gaul, probably Lerins, and later to Marseilles. He was ordained priest about 425. By 430 he was already famous for his learning at Marseilles. He was still living in this town about 480 when Gennadius writes of him : "Vivit usque hodie in senectute bona"[2]. He also gave him the name of *magister episcoporum,* possibly on account of the many *sermons* Salvianus had composed for the use of bishops. If we can judge by his work, his was a blunt and violent character not unlike Tertullian's. He was a careful psychologist but inclined to pessimism; a preaching moralist burning with zeal, who exaggerated the evil he desired to cure.

Of Salvianus' three extant writings[3] (the remainder mentioned by Gennadius are lost) the one most worthy of attention is the treatise *De Gubernatione Dei.* His 9 letters[4] of a "familiar and intimate nature" are models of elegance. The treatise *Against Avarice*[5] (435-439) consists of a very long epistle in four books, written under the pseudonym of Timothy, and addressed to the universal Church. It exhorts the rich laymen and clergy to bequeath their possessions to the Church for the relief of the poor. This doctrine inspired by particular circumstances is perhaps exaggerated when generalised, but it already provides us with a clear

1 Editions: *P. L.,* 53, (Baluze's edit., Paris, 1663-1684). — *Corpus* of Vienna, 1883(1. vm). —*Mon. germ, hist.,* 1887 (t. 1, 1). —Studies: Maoristes, *Hist. Utt. de la France,* t. 11, p. 517-535. — IL J. Giraud, *De Salviano,* Montpellier, 1849 (46 pp.). — L. MÉRY, *Etudes sur Salvien,* Marseille, 1S49 (149 pp.). — G. Valran (on Salvianus as *magister episcoporum :* Latin thesis), Paris, 1899 (64 pp.)·

3 *De viris ill.,* 67. — 3 *Gennadius, De viris ill., 67.*

^.Z.,53, 157174- — 5 53.«73-238.

idea of its author, as a moralist and sociologue. These features are still more prominent in Salvianus' great work.

The De gubernatione Deix, written between 439 and 451, comprises 8 books, dedicated to Salonius, Bishop of Geneva, son of Saint Eucherius. It was inspired by the innumerable evils, following on the barbarian invasions, which afflicted the Roman Empire at this period, and which spared neither the Christians nor the Pagans. The Epicurians and the impious concluded either that God was unjust or remained indifferent to the things of this world *(incuriosus):* some Christians, without denying God's Providence, believed that He awaited the last judgement before restoring the balance. Salvianus opposed his *thesis* to both these opinions: God now and always interests Himself in the government of the world. He first *proves* it by reason and by authority, drawing both on Pagan authors and the Scriptures (Book Ml). He concludes that there is no need to wonder whether the effects willed by Providence are just or unjust: *a priori* they are more than just (ill, I). His descriptions of contemporary manners are coloured by these principles: the Romans have been conquered; the cause is to be sought in their unmentionable vices, and the Christians are all the more guilty inasmuch as their faith obliges them to a greater practice of virtue. The Barbarians are triumphant since they are less corrupt than the Romans. And the author goes on to discover in the latter, all the good that is discernible to an indulgent eye (especially in Book Vil)2. "The way in which he treats his subject" say the Maurists, "clearly shows that his chief purpose was to declaim against the manners of his age. He describes with all possible force and elegance the most ordinary disorders. He breaks out especially against the lewdness of the theatre and profane spectacles, so zealously indeed that he scarcely knows whether to give them the name of impiety or folly, of obscenity or extravagance"3. All his dissertation may be reduced to the expression: *Sola 710s morum nostrorum vitia vicerunt.* (Book VII, 23).

In spite of the exaggerations which lessen its apologetical value this work of Salvianus' possesses great moral

' Λ £·» 53, 25-138.
5 Hence the sympathy that so many German scholars have shown to Salvianus.
' *Hist. lift. France,* n, p. 527.

importance. It was well calculated to inculcate the Romans, especially the Christians, with a full realisation of their duty[1]. These pages written in so pure a style they recall Lactantius, are animated by a bitter eloquence. Rhetorical devices, however, are much in evidence : in some parts the declamatory tone is too emphatic, while occasionally long passages slow down unnecessarily the rapid progress of the theme. It is possible that the author did not find the leisure to polish his work. In any case, it remains, in spite of its defects, one of the finest works of his time.

CHAPTER XIV.

Theologians of the School of Lerins.

Special Bibliography : see the notes for each author.

I. THE ABBEY OF LERINS. TEACHING ON GRACE.

The Abbey of Lerins was one of the most active centres of theological culture in fifth century Gaul. The greatest of the bishops had either received their training there or kept in constant touch with its teaching. Monachism was first planted in Gaul in the fourth century by *Saint Martin*[2] first at Ligugc near Poitiers, and later at Marmoutiers *(majus monasterium}* on the Loire near Tours. At the beginning of the fifth century two other monastic centres were founded in Provence, at *Saint-Victor* of Marseilles about 4102 by Cassian, and in the *island of Lerins* to the south of Cannes and the west of Antibes.

This latter institution, founded some years previous to Saint Victor was the work of Saint Honoratus who gave his name to the ancient island of *Lerina.* Having abandoned considerable possessions and a promising career, he withdrew to this spot together with a few friends in order to live the life of the Oriental solitaries. He was soon followed by many other Christians and within a few years a monastery of fervent monks raised its walls in this spot which before was peopled

[1] The very real moral decadence of the Empire existed before the coming of Christianity. The latter could only endeavour to stay the Hood, and came too late to repair wholly the disaster.

[2] See vol. I, p. 594 sq.

only by snakes. Like Saint Martin, Saint Honoratus modelled his foundation on the *Egyptian monasteries* which were considered to be die most perfect of their kind. Only fragments of his *Rule* and his correspondence are extant. In 426 he was raised to the See of Arles which he occupied until he died in 428. On an anniversary of his death Saint Hilary preached a panegyric known by the name of *Life of Saint Honoratus* [1].

The Abbey of Saint Victor entered into the life of the Church almost wholly by prayer alone and preferred to train its monks in a life of study and contemplation, but *bishops* owed their early education to the Abbey of Lerins. In consequence it exercised a very active influence throughout the whole of Gaul both from a pastoral viewpoint and in the order of doctrine. Lerins thus became the headquarters of veritable school of theology, with clear cut tendencies deriving from Cassian. Like the latter, the Lerinians and the greater number of Provençals ranged themselves against the Augustinian teaching on Grace. Based on altogether different principles from Augustine's, a much simplified notion of the divine aid was conceived. This theory left little room for the supernatural, but did not, however, lead to Pelagius' radical naturalism, His influence was nevertheless in evidence.

The Provençal teaching on grace is fairly well known from two letters sent to Saint Augustine by two of his friends, the laymen Prosper and Hilarius[2]. This theology may be reduced to six principal points [3].

1. "Concerning the power of man to conceive devout sentiments, to form good desires, to regret the past, to begin to believe without the help *of* grace, the teaching in no wise differs from Cassian's. Thtls although man may not possess a full faith in the resources of his nature alone *(fidcs integra)* he can at least regret his weakness *{dolor compuncta infirmitatis);* he can beseech, search, strike on the door of divine mercy[4]".

2.The idea of grace differs from that of Saint Augustine in that there exists no *auxilium quo {volumus),* but only an *auxilium sine quo non {perficimus),* accorded to a nature, fallen and weak indeed, but not absolutely powerless for good, and even supernatural good. " Grace does not properly precede determination and the meritorious act, but merely accompanies them : " gratiam Dei... comitem, non præviam humanorum volunt esse meritorum..." It remains, however, that grace is still necessary in the act and accomplishment of good works[5]".

3.Grace is offered indifferently to all. " All men are called by the natural, the written or the Evangelical law, for God desires the salvation of all men *without distinction :* indifferenter universos... salvos fieri et in agnitionem veritatis venire ". Therefore, says Portalié[6],

[1] Z*. *L.,* 50, 1249-1272.

[2] *Ep.* 225 and 226 *inter Epist. Augustini.* See below, p. 180. Cf. vol. I, p. 316. — [3] See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* ill, p. 279-283.

[4] *ibid.,* p. 279-580. — [5] *Ibid.,* p. 279-280.

[6] E. Portalié, *Augustinisme,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 2519.

there exists a general and common grace, and not a special and *personal* grace assuring the consent of certain souls, which we call *efficacious* grace; freewill alone is the determining factor of the efficacy or otherwise of grace.

4. Perseverance depends on man, since perseverance is accorded to the "prima bona voluntas" : the latter can "suppliciter emereri vel amitti contumaciter" [1]. Hence there is no " gift of perseverance in the strict meaning of the term.

5. Predestination is also dependent on man, for predestination is neither absolute nor gratuitous; it is subordinated to God's foreseeing of the merits of those He has predestined. He has chosen them in His mercy, but He had already foreseen that they would be worthy of His choice and that they would die in grace. There is not, therefore, a fixed number of the elect, since, in reality, each one merits his reward, or causes his own loss.

6. For the Gauls, the action of God is best explained by His prevision of *conditional faith* or conditional merits, and they apply these principles to every case. Thus is explained why some countries have been evangelised and others not, why some children die without baptism. Therefore, it is argued that " there is nothing arbitrary in God's actions; there is nothing in this theory to lead to dispair and spiritual sloth as in the Augustinian system. If the problems of predestination are not solved in this way they serve only to trouble the souls of the faithful and scandalise the weaker vessels... And it were better after all, (0 remain silent on both sides, with regard to these unfathomable questions "[2].

Such were the opinions that reigned in Gaul about 429, and which indeed were defended throughout the fifth century. Saint Augustine's works of refutation *(De pradestinationc sanctorum; De dono perseverantia)*[3] brought no appeasement of the controversy, but gave on the contrary the signal for an intensification of the opposition. The person of Augustine became the object of false insinuations while his ideas were travestied and presented in a hateful guise [4] Nor did these attacks cease with the condemnation at Ephesus in 431 of his great adversary, Julian of Eclanum, and the Pelagians who had joined forces with Nestorius. It became necessary for Pope Saint Celestine I, in 431, at the request of Saint Prosper, to send to the Gallic bishops a letter vindicating Saint Augustine, setting his teaching above all suspicion and advising the bishops to suppress the calumnies of his detractors.

[1] J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, p. 280.
[2] J. Tixeront, *ibid.*, in, p. 281.
[3] See vol. I, p. 636.
[4] See p. 63a.

To this letter were later added ten famous Chapters on Grace *, by the future Pope Saint Leo, entitled " *Prceteritorum sedis Apostolica episcoporum auctoritates de gratia Dei",* which provide a summary and confirmation of the great doctor's teaching. They are taken from Innocent I and the African councils. With Saint Augustine they insist that original sin has weakened human liberty (i)and that the goodness of all created things derives from God alone (2); hence the grace needful for perseverance is *necessary* for all, even the just (3-4) ; that all meritorious works must be inspired by God (5, 6, 7) and that He alone grants "bonæ voluntatis *exordia* et *incrementa* probabilium studiorum et in eis usque in finem *perseverantiam"* (8); lastly, that this universal need of grace is proved by the *prayers of the Church* (9). In the last chapter the other more subtle questions are left open to discussion : "Sicut non audemus contemnere, ita non necesse habemus adstruere "At bottom, concludes Portalié, these *capitula* already determined the true extent of what the Church was always to look upon as essential and catholic in Augustinism : she has since clarified one or two points but she has not changed her teaching"[1][2][3]

Tlie Monitorium of Celestine I did not put an end to controversy in Gaul. Its terms were far too vague and perhaps had been purposely conceived as such with a view to sparing men who were sincerely Catholic and possessed wide authority. It at least had as a result the attenuation of the attacks on Saint Augustine and turned the discussion to the doctrines themselves. Even Faustus of Riez held the Bishop of Hippo in great esteem and quoted him with praise [3].

Although a more or less satisfactory defence has been made of all these personages, the following authors may be taken as representing the Semipelagian teaching.

1) *Cassian* was the first to propagate it[4].

2) *Saint Hilary of Arles* followed at least the tendencies of the Provençale s.

[1] *Capitula de gratia Dei,* or *Indiculus.* In Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion,* n. 129-142. Dom Cappuyns attributes to Saint Prosper the *Capitula* which others believe to be the work of Saint Leo, as well as the *De vocatione omnium gentium* (see p. 90). See *Revue Bin.,* 1927, p. 198-226 and 1929, p. 155-170. On these grounds he characterises St. Prosper's doctrinal attitude as a tendency to attenuate the doctrine of predestination. See the *Recherches de théol. anc. el médiév.,* 1929, p. 309-337. Furthermore, the teaching on predestination which forms the subject of Saint Augustine's last books is not, as is too often said, and as this'author seems to think, the essence of Augustinism.

[2] E. Portalié, *Augustinisme,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2518. Cf. *ibid.,* 2463-2466.

[3] It has been claimed, but without grounds that his citations of Augustine were ironical.

♦ See vol. I, p. 601-603.

- See the following page.

3) *Saint Vincent of Lérins* really seems to have aimed at Saint Augustine, though in an exceedingly discreet and distant manner, in several passages of his Commonitorium. Many critics also regard him as the author of another Semipelagian writing, refuted by Saint Prosper in his *Objectiones vincentianre.* This, however, has never been satisfactorily proved *.

4) After Cassian, *Faustus of Riez* was the chief defender *of* Semipelagianism during the last sixty years of the fifth century[1].

Various *anonymous writings* travesty the Augustinian doctrines in order to discredit them in the eyes of educated Catholics[3].

IL SAINT HILARY OF ARLES (d. 449).

Saint Hilary was a disciple of Honoratus at Lerins and his collaborator at Arles. When his master died (428 or 429), Hilary, although scarcely thirty years of age was called upon to succeed him in the See of Arles. About 430 he preached a fine and delicate panegyric, now known as the *Vita S. Honorati* Hilary is chiefly known for his zeal in extending his interest to the whole of Gaul.

It is probable that he thought himself justified in this by the importance of his see[5] and by the truly extraordinary privileges that pope Zozimus had granted to his predecessor Patrocles in 417, although these had not been confirmed by the succeeding popes. He presided at a number of councils and maintained relations with bishops far removed from Arles. At Auxerre he listened to complaints against Celidonius, Bishop of Besançon and had him deposed in a council in 443 or in 444. Celidonius appealed to Rome and was restored to his see by pope Saint Leo. Hilary having spoken too freely in an attempt to justify himself, was requested by Saint Leo in severe terms[6] to restrain his zeal to his own diocese in the future and to respect the rights of the metropolitans who, in accordance with tradition, are charged with administering their Churches and have the right to fill vacant sees and to

1 See below, p. 171. — 3 See below, p. 171.

3 The best known are:

a) The Quindecim capitula Gallorum, refuted by St. Prosper.

¿) The *Pradestinatus,* a work attributed to /Xrnobius the Younger. See below, p. 175.

4 *P. L.,* 50, 1249-1272.

5 Arles became important from a political point of view at the beginning of the fifth century when it became the residence of the Prefect of Gaul and the Imperial court, after Trier had been abandoned. The Bishop of Arles, simple suffragan of Vienne, was thus called upon to play a more general part in Gaul. The ambitious bishop *Patrocles* (d. 426) carried his intrigues to Rome and even obtained from pope Zozimus in 417 a kind of vicarial power over all the Gallic Churches, and metropolitan jurisdiction in the provinces of Narbonne and Vienne. The affected archbishops vainly protested. Boniface I, however, who succeeded Zozimus did not confirm these privileges. See P. Batiffol, *Le Siège Afiost.,* p. 197-226. —6 Ep. *Divina cultum. Cf. P.* Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 449-460.

ordain those chosenl. The pope was defending tradition and was obeyed. Saint Hilary yielded gracefully2, thus disposing Saint Leo to restore a part of the lost privileges of Arles to his successor. He died about in 449.

In a *life of Saint Hilary of Arles*3 written by a certain Honoratus, perhaps a bishop of Marseilles at the end of the fifth century 4, many writings are attributed to him : homilies for all the feasts of the year, an explanation of the Creed, many letters and one poem. All are lost. Merely insignificant fragments remain, notably a letter to St. Eucherius of Lyons 5. From a doctrinal viewpoint, the Bishop of Arles, who, according to St. Prosper6 professed a great admiration for Saint Augustine, did not, however, admit his theology of grace and shared the prejudices of the Provencals. He was influenced by Lerins, as were the majority in Gaul at that time.

III. SAINT EUCHERIUS OF LYONS7.

Saint Eucherius who was probably one of the best of the fifth century Latin ecclesiastical writers had occupied an eminent post in the world before becoming Bishop of Lyons. The son of a rich family of Lyons, he received a very thorough literary education. His outstanding talents earned for him the rank of senator. After his marriage he sent his two sons, Veranus and Salonius to be brought up by the monks at Lerins. About 422 he himself entered the monastery while his wife went into a convent. After having led the cenobitic life for some years he withdrew alone to the neighbouring island of *Leros* (now Ste-Marguerite) in order

1 An allusion to another bishop deposed by Hilary outside his province.

2 Thus showing that he had acted through zeal rather than in a spirit of revolt. It would be even more mistaken to see in him the ringleader of a nationalist party of the Gallo-Roman episcopacy rising up against a new monarchical discipline invested in St. Leo. Against this theory of Babut, see P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 456. — 3 *P. L.,* 50, 1219-1246.

4 According to the interpolated ch. 99 of Gennadius' *De viris ill.*

5 *P. L.,* 50, 1271.

6 " Unum eorum præcipuæ auctoritatis et spiritualium studiorum virum, sanctum Hilarium, arelatensem episcopum, sciat beatitudo tua admiratorem, sectatoremoue in aliis omnibus tuæ esse doctrinæ. " *Epist. (Aug.)* 225, 9.

7 Editions: *P. L.,* 50, 701*832- *Corpus of Vienna,* 1891 (t. 31), ed. K. WOTKE. Studies: A. Mellier, *De vita et scriptis Sti Eucherii* (thesis), Lyons, 1878. A. GOUILLOUD, *St. Eucher, Lirins et l'Eglise de Lyon ju siècle,* Lyons, 1S81. P. Godet, *Eucher (saint)* in *Dici, thiol.,* col. 1452-*454-

to live there as an anchorite. From there he was brought unwillingly to occupy the see of Lyons, of which he was one of the most illustrious bishops. During his lifetime his two sons were also raised to the episcopacy in Provence[1]. He died about 450-455.

There are extant, bearing the name of Saint Eucherius a fairly large number of writings, but their authenticity is not equally certain. The commentaries on Genesis and on the books of Kings, as well as the abridgements of Cassian's works (the Institutions and the Conferences) and the letter *ad Philonem,* must be rejected out of hand. Tho other letters *(ad Faustum de sifu Jadee et urbis hierosolymitance* and the *Exhortatio ad monachos duplex)* are doubtful, as well as a part of the *homilies* that are ascribed to him. It is *probable* that St. Eucherius was the author of the *Martyrdom* of the Theban legion[1]. Four writings at least are certainly authentic, and all are of a fairly well defined ascetic and mystical nature : the first two *(De laude eremi,* to St. Hilary of Arles, and *De contemptu mundi et scecularis philosophice,* to his kinsman Valerianus)[3] are a delicate and not unenthusiastic expression of the love of retreat and solitude with God : the other two, more important, are scriptural manuals.

These exegetical treatises were dedicated by St. Eucherius to his sons: the *Fornuilce spiritualis infelli'gentice*[4] to Veranus and the *Instructiones*[3] to Salonius. The latter gives the solution to various difficulties of *literal* interpretation throughout the whole Bible : the former, on the contrary, teaches Veranus to aspire to *spiritual exegesis,* or in other words, that perfect knowledge of God and the divine mysteries which is the purpose of all Biblical study. A result of the great vogue enjoyed by these works and especially the *Formula,* during the Middle Ages was the introduction into the text of vast interpolations which it has been impossible as yet, to separate from the original[6]. Unlike many other Gauls of his time, Eucherius was a zealous defender of Saint Augustine: there could be no better guarantee of his excellent theological sense.

IV. SAINT VINCENT OF LERINS[7].

The monk Vincent of Lerins who seems to have spent his life in the famous abbey and who died about 450 is known

1 Salonius at Geneva, Veranus at Vence (Alpes-Maritimes).

3 *Passio agaunensium martyrum, P. L.,* 50, 827-832.

3 7' *L.,* 50, 701-712; 711-726. These are two letters.

4 *P. L·,* 50, 727-772. — 5 *P. L.,* 50, 773-822.

6 The doubtful and apocryphal works are to be found in *P. L.,* 50, 8331214.

7 Editions : *P. L.,* 50, 637-686. P. de Labriolle, 5. *Vincent de Lerins* (text. French trans.) : Coll. *Pensée chrét.,* Paris, 1906 (Brunetière's preface). Studies W. S. Reilly, *Etude sur la règle defoi de S. Vincent de L.* (thesis), Tours, 1903. A. Louis, *Etude sur S. Vincent de L.,* in *Rev. cl. Jr.,* 1895 (11), p. 271. R. PoviEL, *De utroque comm, lirinensi* (thesis), Nancy, 1896 (the author identifies Vincent with Marius Mercator, Cf. other thesis, 1898). See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 324-334.

especially by his Commonitorium, which has earned him undying fame. This work in 33 chapters was written three years after the Council of Ephesus in 434. The *title,* says Baluse, indicates " notes set down in writing as an aid to the memory The author's purpose was to provide Catholics with precise rules for finding truth in the event of controversies of a religious nature. The work comprises two parts: the *first* (ch. 1-28) is of greater interest since it is here that the author explains his rules, which will be summarised below; the *second* (ch. 29-33) III present state is no more than a summary of the second Commonitorium, written by Vincent himself to replace a text which, according to Gennadius, had been stolen : this latter detail is doubted by many critics. Whatever may be the case this last part of the work does no more than apply the principles previously laid down, to later heresies, notably Nestorianism ; hence the stress laid on the Council of Ephesus.

The Commonitorium is skilfully composed. The ideas are logically developed in the following order : ch. I : *preface : Peregrinus* (Vincent's pseudonym) indicates his purpose; ch. II-III : *the author* s theme :* there exists a *general criterium* for distinguishing religious truth from error; here the criterium is proposed and applied to particular cases; ch. iv-xix : *proof of the thesis* by means of various instances taken from the history *of* the Church (Donatism, Arianism, the Rebaptisers, Nestorius, Photinus, Apollinaris); ch. XX-XXVIII : a relatively long *general conclusion.* This contains :

a) a definition of the true Catholic (ch. xx-xxii) : he who avoids all doctrinal novelty;

P) a very important new principle regarding the lawful progress of dogma (ch. XXIII);

r) a reason for having recourse to the general principle given at the outset : this reason is found in the abuse of the Scriptures by the heretics (ch. XXIV-XXVII) :

f lastly, a practical method for using the opinions of the Fathers (ch. XXVIII).

The whole work, as may be seen, has as its centre, the famous chapter II which contains the criterium of religious truth according to Vincent. The canon of St. Vincent, as it is called, may be thus formulated : " In ipsa item Ecclesia catholica magnopere curandum est ut *id teneamus* quod *ubique,* quod *semper,* quod *ab omnibus* creditum est; hoc est enim vere, proprieque *catholicum...* Hoc ita demum fiet, si sequamur *universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem* " [1].

[1] *Comrn.,* II.

Vincent, it is true, supposes (ch. III) that the first condition may be lacking at times, but not the other two [1]. The theological value of the canon of Vincent of Lerins has been greatly discussed, especially in the nineteenth century. It was by resorting to this canon that Dollinger thought he could oppose tradition to the Vatican Council. But he was wrong in isolating it from the other rules of faith. As Franzelin observes[2], this canon is true *sensu affirmante* but not necessarily so *sensu excludente* : there may be some true doctrine which does not fully accord with these conditions, a doctrine which has not been explicitly professed always and everywhere. Such a doctrine can become known by means of authority, through definition by the Church. Vincent himself recognised the lawfulness of this other rule of faith; the *Church* speaking in the name of Christ and deciding in the last resort what is certain and revealed truth in the writings of the Fathers [3]. However, the importance he ascribes to his criterium leaves somewhat in the shade this great and after all, ultimate rule of faith which is the Church, and is even capable of leading many of the faithful not competent in such things to misdirected *personal* research in early tradition.

The great originality of the work, however, does not lie in this celebrated canon in which Vincent does no more than repeat what all the Fathers, who treated this subject, had already said before him, especially *Tertullian* in the "*De præscriptione*" and Saint Augustine *(passim).* With Labriolle we can give him credit for having " meditated on these scattered affirmations, for having fixed them in clear striking decisive formulas which have imposed themselves on posterity ", but we should also remark that the monk of Lerins detserves far more credit for his brilliant and profound chapter XXIII where he teaches that the immutability of its essentials does not exclude a *certain progress,* a certain development of Christian dogma.

The nature of this development is here determined in a way that still retains its value. A progress is possible; it may even be considerable *(habeatur plane et maximus),* but must not imply a Change *(sedita tamen ut vere profectus sit, non permutatio) :* progress means

[1] *Ibid.,* III.

[2] *De divina trad, et script.·,* th. 24, p. 289-294. If everything that fulfils the indicated conditions is to be accepted, it does not follow that any doctrine lacking one or the other of these characters should be excluded. — [3] *Comm.,* XXVIII.

the growth of a thing which remains essentially the same, while change supposes the transformation of one thing into another. Thus the growth and progress of the mind, of knowledge, of wisdom, whether of the individual or the entire social body, whether of single man or the whole Church, according to the epoch and the century, are permissible; — but provided that this growth is exactly adapted to their particular nature, i. e., in the same doctrine, the same sense, the same idea[1] *(sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, codent sensu, eademque sententia).* Vincent then goes on to explains his meaning with the help of two comparisons taken from the growth of the human body and seeds. He observes that dogmas may be polished and refined, acquire new evidence and clarification, yet still retain their plenitude, their integrity and essential meaning. Lastly he shows that the only purpose of the councils has been " to propose to a *more reflective* belief, that which was previously assented to in all simplicity; to preach *more insistently* what, until then, was preached but slackly, to have that more *diligently* honoured which previously was honoured with a more peaceful certainty". In its conciliary decrees, the Church "has characterised certain articles of faith having nothing new in them, by new and well chosen terms (non novum fidei sensum novæ adpellationis proprietate signando) "[2][3]

It has been observed that Vincent ascribes no part to philosophy in dogmatic development. That is a characteristic of the age. Philosophy was destined to be neglected for long centuries by churchmen. Some indeed abused it. " Saint Peter Chrysologus roundly declares that philosophy is an invention of the devil, that the rostrum of the philosophers is a plague spot since they have been unable to discover and preach the true God "[3]. Vincent did not go to such lengths but he refrained from having recourse to this servant of theology.

Certain critics have regarded the Commonitorium as a Semipelagian manifesto, a controversial writing against Saint Augustine and his defenders. This affirmation if taken in all its strictness is most certainly false. Most modern

1 Synonymous expressions indicating the deep objective content of doctrinal formulas which may vary.

2 " It is not easy to judge, says P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.,* p. xc sq., to what extent *Newman's* much more developed and complicated theory of the development of doctrine is connected with Vincent's. Newman draws but little on Vincent. Some theologians believe that the divergences which are sometimes pointed out do not really exist, since both admit a *vital* progress and claim a *typical unity:* Vincent however viewed the question from a strictly theological angle in a succint manner, whilst Newman treated it in a long work from a historical and psychological viewpoint". *(An essay on the development of Christian doctrine* (1S49). This essay, written in part before his conversion is far from representing Newman's ultimate ideas.

3 J. T1XERONT, *Hist. Doçrn.,* III, p. 333.

authors, however recognise that it contains some truth, and believe that Augustine is really aimed at in chaps. XXVI and XXVIII, in which it is supposed that the *privata opiniuncule* are no other than various doctrines of the Bishop of Hippo. Such a secondary controversial purpose provides an excellent motive for the use of the pseudonym *Peregrinus*. The critics also agree in ascribing to Vincent the authorship of the *Objectiones Vincentiance* refuted by Saint Prosper r Saint Augustine's great protagonist. Vincent, unlike Augustine was but little given to speculation and we need not be surprised that having poorly understood certain theories of the great doctor, he showed little love for them.

V. FAUSTUS OF RIEZ 3.

Faustus of Riez, a native of Great Britain, after having studied philosophy and rhetoric, entered the Monastery of Lerins while still young, about 426. He became Abbot in 433 and before 462 had succeeded to the See of Riez (in the present Lower Alps) which he occupied until the last years of the fifth century. Faustus soon acquired a great reputation in the Church of Gaul both for his theological knowledge and his eloquence, and his zeal for the spiritual and temporal good of his people. He was driven out of his diocese by King Euric, who was irritated by his attacks on Arianism, and did not return until this prince died in 485. Of chief interest to modern dogmatic historians is his struggle against the Predestinationism attributed to the priest Lucidus (at the Council of Arles, 475) and his treatise *De Gratia* in two books, which will be treated below. The exact date of his death is unknown (end of the fifth cent.).

The writing's of Faustus are in a great measure no longer extant and many have never been known.

a) His correspondence must have been great, for he was one of the most outstanding bishops of his century in Gaul; but only ten letters remain3;

' See below, p. 185.

3 Editions: *P. L.,* 58; *Corpus of Vienna,* 1891, t. 21 (Engelbrecht's ed.). Studies: *E. Simon, Etude sur S. Fauste,* Toulon, 1879. A. Engelbrecht, *Studien zu den Schriften des... Faustus,* Vienna, 1889; *Patristiche AnaleJiten,* Vienna, 1892. A. Koch, *Des hl. Faustus,* Stuttgart, 1895. 1*. Godet, *Fauste de Riez,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2101-2105. J. Tixeront, *jEst. Dogm.,* m, p. 293-300. —3 Edit. *Engelbrecht,* p. 159-220. *P.* 5θ» ^35*^7° U9 letters).

b} Most of his sermons are also lost, for he was a prolific and eloquent preacher: in addition to the 8 sermons published under his name [*], the editor of the Corpus of Vienna attributed to him not only numbers 8 and 9 of the collection of homilies *of the* Pseudo-Eusebius of Emesa, but the whole 56 of the series', which is hardly probable[3], and also 22 others of a series [4] which likewise contains alien elements. In reality his oratorical work has not yet been finally determined.

c) Opuscula. There are extant three of Faustus' theological and philosophical opuscula :

1. In a little treatise *De Spiritu Sancto*[5] it is proved that the third Person of the Blessed Trinity is consubstantial and co-eternal with the Father and the Son.

2. Another writing *Adversus arianos et niacedonianos,* mentioned by Gennadius, also seems to be preserved, though the critics do not agree in identifying it[6].*

3. In the opusculum *Adversus eos qui dicunt esse in creaturis aliquid incorporeum*[7] Faustus, like Cassian, clearly asserts the material nature of the human soul : all creatures which occupy space must be corporeal; God alone is incorporeal. Faustus was refuted by Claudianus Mamertus in his famous treatise *De statu animce*[8].

d) The De gratia[9], in 2 books especially compromised its author for it enjoyed unquestioned authority in Semipelagian circles.

The predestinarían error of the priest LUCIDUS [10] of the diocese of Riez gave rise to the *De Gratia.* Predestinarianism asserts that there exists in God a predestination of the lost to hell as well as predestination of the elect to merit and heaven. Further, it supposes an irresistible impulse of the divine power impelling some to good and others to evil.

It has sometimes been wondered whether such a heresy really did exist in the fith century or whether it was not a pure invention of the Semipelagians who, having misunderstood the true Augustinism, sought to render it hateful. Various opinions have been aired on this subject. Some simply denied the existence of Predestinarians (Jansenists, and even Catholics such as Thomassin); others have tried to explain the bitterness of the Semipelagian struggle by the existence

1 *P. L.,* 58, S69-890. — 2 See vol. I, p. 316.

3 Dom Morin has criticised Engelbrecht's method and rejected his conclusions. *Rev. bened.,* 1892 (t. ix), p. 49-Ó1). The attribution of numbers 8 and 9 to Faustus is admitted.

4 Contents of the codex *Durlacensis* at Karlsruhe.

5 *P. L·.,* 62, 9-40 (under the name of Paschasius). Caspari and Engelbrecht have restored it to Faustus.

6 See V. Gopet, *op. cit.,* or O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte,* tv. p 8

1 *P. L.,* 58, 837-845·

s See below, p. 179.

9 *P. L.,* 58, 783-838·

,0 E. Amman, *Lucidus,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 1020-1024.

of a strong predestinarían party (Sirmond). Portaìié says that according to sober Protestant and Catholic critics the truth is to be found between these two extremes' : There really were Predestinanans, but they were few and never really formed a sect. The priest Lucidus was one of these irresponsible interpreters of the Augustinian doctrine. It is quite impossible that Faustus should have invented all this affair, together with the documents that concern it.

Faustus at first made use of persuasion to obtain from Lucidus a retractation of his errors. Seeing the uselessness of his exhortations he proceeded to use his authority and asked him in writing to subscribe to six anathematisms condemning his teaching, under pain of being denounced to the Council of Arles which was about to meet (473 or 475). This council approved the measures taken by Faustus. Lucidus submitted, and in a letter written to the Council of Lyons, held shortly after Arles, went one better than his bishop by enumerating a whole series of errors that he rejected.

On the demand of the Council of Arles, Faustus completed his work by composing a theological treatise on the controverted question. This was the *De gratia.* Certain critics consider the Semipelagian formulas in this writing as no more than exaggerated expressions aimed at Predestinarianism. But it would seem that they really represent Faustus' own ideas. He endeavoured to adopt *&via media* between Pelagius'teaching which he energetically combated, and Predestinarianism in the sense of absolute predestination, even predestination to merit and glory, which seemed to him to be contrary to the justice of God and detrimental to moral teaching. He even combated the writings of Saint Augustine, though he treated the writer with respect. He himself admitted only the predestination consisting in *divine foreknowledge* which foresees what is accomplished by man's freewill. Thus he came back to Cassian's *Semifelogianism.* The free will can desire, wish for, and evocate the grace of which it has need; grace is the result and reward of this effort[2]. Sometimes indeed Faustus appears to go still further and make all graces no more than exterior graces[3].

1 E. Portaiıé, *Augustinisme,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 2522-2524.

2 The will takes the initiative; grace does no more than co-operate. See *De Gratia,* II, 2. Moreover Faustus speaks less of an action of grace on the will, than of a kind of alliance of the will and grace for the production of the salutary work. Further, he seems to establish no more than a difference of degree between natural virtue and supernatural perfection : *Non periit actio elsi amissa est perfectio. De Gratia,* I, S. Cf. P. Godet, *op. cit.,* 2104.

3 Consolations of the Scriptures, reproaches, exhortations, fear of the judgment, promise of heaven. *De Gratta,* I, 16. Cf. J. Tixeroni, *Hid. Dogai.,* Ill, 296.

Faustus' work was not attacked during his lifetime : during all the final years of the fifth century and the first years of the sixth, the Provencals continued to base their teaching upon it. Its tendencies are easily to be found in the two works of Gennadius of Marseilles *(De vins illustribus* and *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus}* .* Some years later2 it occasioned the re-opening of the controversy and thus provoked a final solution 3 which ecclesiastical authority had till then refrained from giving concerning one of the gravest and most complicated of theological questions.

VI. ARNOBIUS THE YOUNGER ‹.

Arnobius the Younger 5 was a monk at Rome in the middle of the fifth century. It is possible that he was a native of Africa rather than Gaul as has been supposed. He was a more or less cunning adversary of the Augustinian doctrine of grace. Knowledge of his work was somewhat vague until it was better determined by recent studies. It would appear to date from the pontificate of Saint Leo. The author is not otherwise known.

The Commentary on the psalms 6, his chief work, is extremely allegorical and that its teaching is Semipelagian if not Pelagian is shown in its unambiguous expressions.7 Saint Augustine is often in question though he is never named.

The Expositiunculæ in evangelium8 is a collection of notes arranged in no particular order on various passages of Saint John, Saint Matthew and Saint Luke.

The Conflictus Arnobii catholici cum Serapione Ægyptio 9 by means of a fictitious discussion refutes Egyptian Monophysitism and a number of other errors ; Sabellianism, Arianism, and even Pelagianisin. The author, although he quotes Saint Augustine, remains a Semipelagian and may very well be Arnobius.

A Liber ad. Gregorium ,u, attributed to Saint John Chrysostom by Saint Isidore of Seville, may also be due to Arnobius; it is an ascetic treatise on patience and the struggle with vice.

* Sec Mow p. 225. — 2 See below p. 194. — 3 See below p. 203.

4 Editions : *P. L.,* 53. Studies : D. Morin, *Etudes, textes, découvertes,* Marcdsous, 1913, 1, p. 309-324, 340-382. *Anecdota Maredsolana,* 1903 (t. ill), p. 129-151; *Rev. bénéd.,* 1903, (t. 20), p. 64-76; 1909 (t. 26), p. 419-432. II. Kayser, *Die Schriften des sogenannten Arnobius junior,* Gutersloh, 1912. O. Bar DENHEWER, *Geschichle,* IV, p. 603-606 and 529-521.

Thus named to distinguish him from Arnobius of Sicca. Cf. vol. 1, p. 270-271.

i'· D, 53, 327-570. Studies on the text by J. SCHNARGEL, in *Wiener Studien,* 1916, 1921.

Vor instance: In arbitrio est ut credas prius, ut cum credideris gratiam consequaris. In *Ps.* 90, *P. L.,* 53, 458.

° *∕· L,* 53, 569-580, and better, D. Morin, *Anecdota,* loot

' *P. L·,* 53. 239-322.

«° I). Morin, *Etudes,* p. 383-439. Cf. *ibid.,* 325.340.

It is not quite so certain that Arnobius is the author of the famous Prædestinatus [1] although D. Morin ascribes this work to him. The author admittedly shares Arnobius' prejudices and even surpasses him in *odium theologicum.* The treatise comprises three parts : The first based on Saint Augustine's *De hæresibus,* gives a list of 90 heresies from Simon Magus to " Predestinarían heresy " [2], according to a supposed writing of the Bishop of Hippo, and the third refutes this last heresy by means of arguments often borrowed from Julian of Eclanum. The work was composed under Pope Sixtus III (432-440), at the time of the first Semipelagian controversies.

CHAPTER XV-

The Augustinian Theologians.

Special Bibliography : see the note for each author.

I. THE DISCIPLES OF SAINT AUGUSTINE IN GENERAL.

A) General outline.

From the fifth century the entire West was inspired by Saint Augustine [3]. Even those who would not follow his teaching on grace, such as Saint Hilary of Arles[4], could scarce refrain from admiration and respect for the work of the great doctor as a whole. Even in Lerinian circles he did not lack zealous defenders, such as, for instance, Saint Eucheriuss. If, in a sense all the Latin authors after Saint Augustine may be said to depend on him, there are some who particularly deserve to be called *his disciples.*

[1] *P. L.*, 53, 587-672. Cf. H. von Schubert, *Def S. Prade$linatust* in *Text. u. Unlers.y* 24, Leipsic, 1903. See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte,* IV, p. 520-521.

[3] Quos Deus semel praedestinavit ad vitam, etiam si negligant, etiam si peccent, etiam si nolint, ad vitam perducentur inviti; quos autem praedestinavit ad mortem, etiam si currant, etiam si festinent, sine causa laborant. *P. L.,* 53, 623. That is an abominable travesty of Augustinian teaching.

[3] See above, p. 9 and vol. I, p. 714-716.

[4] See above, p. 163. — [5] See above, p. 167.

The latter either collaborated with him, or used his writings more copiously, or defended his doctrinal positions by adopting as nearly as possible his point of view.

Among these disciples we would class : *Marius Mercator* who helped him in the Pelagian and Nestorian controversies; *Claudianus Maniertus,* who defended his teaching on the spiritual nature of the soul; *Julianus Pomarus* who made great use of Augustine in his synthesis of pastoral teaching; *Saint Prosper* and *Saint Fulgentius* who explained and justified particularly his doctrine of grace against the Semipelagians. *Saint Ccesarius of Arles* was a zealous and untiring pastor of souls : and it was be also who had the merit of putting an end to the Semipelagian controversies by obtaining recognition in Gaul and approval from Rome for the essential traits of the Augustinian teaching on grace expressed in a modified form. The following chapter will be devoted to a study of this author.

B) Saint Augustine's disciples and grace.

The better to understand the attitude adopted by Saint Augustine's disciples as regards this capital question, we must here recall the doctrinal positions he himself held. These may be reduced to five chief points : [1]

1. relative fall of the human race, which, on account *of* original sin, has become a *massa perditionis;*

2. the need, for proper supernatural activity, of a grace which not only aids the will, but gives free will;

3. the absolute gratuity of first graces and perseverance, and hence all the means *of* salvation ;

4. the gratuitous predestination *of* the elect to faith, to holiness and eternal glory; the others being abandoned to the way of perdition ;

5. a will to save all men, which is limited (i. e., consequent will).

This doctrine is based on two fundamental principles which characterise Saint Augustine's point of view and which must be faithfully borne in mind if his teaching is not to be distorted, *a)* In the first place it is based on a twofold *fact, known by faith;* that of the degeneration of man from the supernatural state in which he was created, and that of the eternal existence of two cities; a city of God which manifests His mercy and an infernal city revealing his justice". *b)* It insists strongly on the *rights of God* and his sovereign independence with regard to his creatures[3]. God Who is the essential Good and Being,

[1] See vol. I, p. 678-686. — [2] Vol. 1. p. 678 and p. 690.

[3] Augustine bases this teaching chiefly on St. Paul's text (Rom., IX, 10-29) relating to God's preference of Jacob to Esau; it is possible that he forces the meaning of the text in some small measure, but his doctrine is established on many other data. See *De Prudestinalione sanctorum; De dono perseverantia.*

Truth and Wisdom, is the principle of all good, even in the beings he created free ; but evil can in no way be attributed to Him, though He can permit it and in His justice punishes it*.

No matter how certain were such principles, they gave rise to a number of disadvantages. On the one hand the historical viewpoint led to a desire for a rational and complete solution of the problem, while on the other hand, this solution was sought particularly and only indirectly *from the divine angle.* The human aspect of the problem remained too much in the shade through lack of insistence on freewill; and even the divine aspect, through fear of compromising God's omnipotence, was treated with too much regard to historical fact, (i. e., the consequent will), to the excessive neglect of God's antecedent will to save all men.

In face of the Semipelagian reaction, which attracted violent attention to the human aspect of the problem of grace and even ended by denying the gratuity of the latter, Saint Augustine's first disciples adopted fairly divergent positions. Some refused to admit any compromise, for instance Saint Fulgentius who did not hesitate to reproduce the most disputed theses of Augustine. Others made various concessions to their opponents, which did not entail the abandonment of his teaching, but merely the partial abandonment of his point of view. Predestination was chiefly in question. Others again, without condemning the teaching, preferred to remain silent, thus revealing, that to their minds, no degree of certainty had yet been achieved : such was the case of Saint Cæsarius of Arles whose attitude, which corresponded tothat of Saint Leo 2 was approved by the pope who sanctioned the Council of Orange3. Others made formal and precise additions : thus, Saint Prosper maintained the gratuity of predestination, but attributed damnation to foreknowledge of personal sins;4 the *De vocatione omnium Gentium* distinguishes a *general* grace offered to all, and *isftecial* grace vouchsafed to the elects. Lastly, in addition to the special will of God regarding the chosen, His (antecedent) will to save all men was more and more affirmed.

In spite of these attenuations, the disciples of Saint Augustine still maintained the doctrino of predestination on the dogmatic principles given it by the Bishop of Hippo : predestination to glory and to all the graces that lead thereto, faith, sanctification, perseverance; in a word, the *prédestinâtio adaquate sumpta**, in modern theological terminology. The theological problems that were raised were chiefly dealt with from the divine aspect. Saint Thomas, a true disciple of Augustine, solved these problems in the same manner and carefully distinguished total

' See vol. I, p. 693-694. — 2 See above, p. 134.
3 See p. 204. — 4 See p. 189. — 5 See p. 190.
6 Predestination is sometimes taken as meaning the call to faith, to grace, to merit; but such is a question of particular *effects* rather than the essence of predestination. Even for Saint Augustine, the latter has eternal *,fory* for its chief object. But eternal glory may be considered from a threefold point of view : *a)* in its preparation by faith and grace; *b)* in its ultimate realisation, together withall that leads to it; r) in this final realisation alone. Thus may be distinguished a threefold predestination : the first *incomplete* or *partial* extending only to the first effects; the second *adequate,* extending to the totality of effects; the third, *inadequate* or *abstract* dealing only with the last effects, or glory *in se.*

or adequate predestination, which is absolutely gratuitous, from special predestination to one or other of its effects [*]. The early Augustinians did exactly the same [†]. As for the question of predestination to glory in itself, *in abstracto*[3], which has so divided theologians since the sixteenth century, the Fathers do not seem to have considered it from this angle. Bossuet in his answers to Richard Simon, speaking of Augustine, rightly remarks : " You must note the difference between the question of predestination as it is treated in the schools among orthodox doctors, and as established by Saint Augustine against the enemies of grace[4]". Bossuet who judged these "abstractions" of the Schools to be " useless enough at bottom ", considered that Augustine did no more than explain t le faith. This applies in great measure to his disciples.

II. MARIUS MERCATORS.

Marius Mercator was a friend of Augustine or at least fought by his side in the struggle against heresy. Little is known of his life. He was an African and, it would seem, a layman. He was at Rome about 418 when Augustine wrote to him to thank him for certain *opuscula* he had received from him, and to congratulate him on his progress in theology[6]. About 429 he was at Constantinople, involved in the first Nestorian controversies, and perhaps charged with keeping the Holy See informed of happenings in the East. It is at least certain that he kept the West in touch with the first Christological controversies just as in the East he had made known the struggle that Rome and Africa were waging against Pelagius. It is possible that he lived until the Council of Chalcedon (451) though we possess no definite proof. Mercator was neither a great writer nor a very deep thinker. He was especially noted for his translations, usually very exact.

There remain two of Mercator's original mémoires relating to the Pelagian controversy : the *commonitorium super nomine Cœlestii* (429)[7],

[*] *Sunt, theol.,* I, q. xxiii, a. 5. See the wholly Augustinian solution to the third objection (ad 3UI").

[†] They insisted above all on its gratuity. The terms *ante* and *post proviso, nterila,* correspond but imperfectly to their point of view : in total, adequate predestination, *merit* is included, but is *gratuitous.*

[3] See below, p. 758.

[4] *Offense de la tradition et des saints Pères,* XII, c. 16.

[5] Editions : *P. L.,* 48, (Garnier's ed., 1673); better, Gallandi, *Bibliotheca,* vm (Baluze's ed., 1684). Studies : E. Amann, *M. Mercator,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 24S1-24S5. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte,* tv, p. ζ - ζο. Cf. TlLLEMONT, *Mémoires,* XV, p. 136-I43. K

[6] *Epist.* 193. — [7] *P. L.,* 48, 63-108.

sent in Greek to the Emperor Theodosius 11 and translated into Latin by the author, and published after the Council of Ephesus: it consists of a summary account of the various condemnations of Cælestius and Pelagius, and ends with a pressing appeal to Julian of Eclanum ; the *Commonitoriimi adversus hœresim Pelagii et Coelestii vel eliam serif›ta Julianil,* after 431, contains, after a short historical introduction, extracts from Julian's writings, together with a refutation in the form of notes; hence the title sometimes given to this mémoire : *Liber subnotationum in verba Juliani*2,

The documents that Mercator translated are preceded by a short introduction. Some deal with the Pelagian controversy : 4 of Nestorius' sermons on the sin of Adam and its consecjuences3. Others more numerous treat of the Nestorian heresy : another 5 of Nestorius sermons4; correspondence of Cyril and Nestorius5; extracts from Nestorius made by Saint Cyril6; creed of Theodore of Mopsuestia preceded by an introduction and followed by a refutation 7 : Mercator looked upon 'Theodore as the father both of Pclagianism and Nestorianism. The authenticity of other translations ascribed to him is less well established8.

III. CLAUDIANUS MAMERTOS

Claudianus Mamertus (f about 474), priest of the Church of Vienna, of which his younger brother Saint Mamertus, was bishop is chiefly famous for his vigorous defence of the spirituality of the soul. Faustus of Riez 10 had maintained that the soul is corporeal since it is localised quantitatively *Ep.* Ill, V). In this work which attempts to establish the corporeal nature of all created beings, he bases his opinion on Saint Jerome and Cassian. His ideas were at least shared by Gennadius of Marseilles. Claudianus Mamertus undertook the refutation of this false teaching and thus carried on the work of Saint Augustine, who, although hesitating between Traducianism and Creationism as regards

'*Ibid.,* 169-172. — - See Garnier's edition in *P. L.,* 48.

3 £., 48, 1S9-202; Introduction, *ibid.,* 183-187. See also M. Jugie, *Nestorius,...* p. 84-85.

4 These are, according to *P. L.,* 48, 757 sq., sermons 1, iv, vu, xii, XIII. Mercator introduces them with two letters (*P. L.,* 48, 753-756, 773-774) in the form of a preface, wherein he connects Nestorius with Paul of Samosata, and possibly not without good reason. — 5 *P. L.,* 48, 801-827.

6 *Ibid.,* 897-904. — 7 *Ibid.,* 1041-1050.

8 Even that of Nestorius' xn contra anathematisms, *Ibid.,* 909-923 and appendix, 924-932.

9 Editions: *P. L.,* 53, (Schott's ed. 1618); A. Engelbrecht, in *Corpus of Ct'eima,* XI. Studies: E. Amann, *Manieri (Claudica)* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1809-1811. A. C. Germain, *De Mamerti Claudiani scriptis et philosophia.* (thesis), Montpellier, 1S40. R. de la Broise, *Mamerti Claudiani vita eiusqtte doctrina de anima hominis* (thesis) Paris, 1890. — 10 See above, p. 175.

the origin of the soul, had no doubts whatever about its spirituality, after he had made the acquaintance of the Neo-Platonist writings ».

Mamertus' work *Concerning the nature of the soul (De statu anima)* 1, composed between 467-472, is divided into three books : the first unfolds the philosophical proofs ; the second arguments from authority; the third answers Faustus' objections. " One of his favourite arguments is : that were the soul not spiritual it would be unable to rise to absolute truth. But he had no difficulty in showing against Faustus that the soul, although spiritual and therefore in this respect like to God, has nevertheless nothing which makes it equal to the divine substance (l, 5). First, it is not the whole of man but only a part : " In duabus substantiis constat homo, immortali et illocali anima, et mortali et locali corpore" (ili, li). Further, God is exempt from all accidental qualities, He is above time and space. The soul, on the contrary, possesses accidental qualities, and although, like the body, it is not subject to local measurement, at least it is not free *of* the laws of time (ill, 15)" 34

The priest of Vienna possessed an extremely cultured intelligence formed at the school of Aristotle and Plato, but inspired chiefly by Saint Augustine \ The nobility and vigour of the author's mind, says Bardenhewer, the shrewdness of his views, the force of his dialectic, together with his deep moral feeling so reminiscent of Saint Augustine, would grace the philosopher of any age5. These qualities amply compensate the few errors of detail6 and the few extravagances that have crept into his work. With the exception of this treatise only two of his *letters* are extant; one to Sidonius Apollinarius 7 on the subject treated in the above work. His poetical compositions are lost; those ascribed to him are of doubtful authenticity.

IV. JULIANUS POMARUS8.

Julianus Pomarus, a native of Mauritania^ left Africa probably at the time of the Vandal invasion and settled

1 For the principles of the teaching see vol. 1, p. 617, 623, 642-643, Cf. *Di gen. ad lilt.·,* bk x, Ch. XXV, 41.

- *P. L.,* 53, 697-780. Lengthy analysis in Ceillier, Hist., X, p. 346-356.

3 P. Vallet, *Hist, de la Philosophie,* p. 173.

4 He makes an extraordinary eulogy of Augustine : *op. cit.,* it, 9.

5 *Pat.* ni, p. 122-123. Cf. *Geschichte,* IV, p. 593.

6 He shares the fairly common opinion of his time which attributed an extremely subtile body to the angels, while giving them an immaterial soul like that of men. See alxive, p. 100.

7 *P. L.,* 53, 779-781. The Bishop of Clermont, coming to Vienne shortly after the death of Mamertus, in 474, composed an epitaph which he sent to Mamertus' nephew. Petreius. SiD. Apoll., *Epist.,* Bk. IV, II; *P. L.,* 58, 315.

Edition: *P. L.,* 59» (edit, of the *Opera S. Prosperi,* 1711). Studies*. Ceillier, *Hist. ant. eccl.,* xv, p. 451-472. *Hist, littéraire de la France,* π-p. 665-675. L. Valentinas. *Prosper,* p. 651-655. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte,* IV, p. 599-601. Chief sources: Gen'NADIUS, *De viris ill..* 98; S. Isidore of Sev., *De viris ill.,* 25. — ' According to Gennadius.

at Arles. He was a talented rhetor and for a long period taught literature to the sons of senators and the younger clergy \ earning a well deserved reputation. Ennodius of Pavia tried to draw him to Italy, telling him that he also loved Cicero2. Ruricius of Limoges declared himself to be the disciple of his soul : he gave him the title of abbot, a proof that Julianus, having entered the religious life had become the head of a monastery. Gennadius tells us he was a priest. This author mentions and gives a summary of his great philosophical work, now lost, *De natura animae et qualitate ejus;* he also attributes to him two ascetic treatises : *De contemptu mundi* (also lost) and *De vitiis et virtutibus,* which would seem to be the *De vita contemplativa* of which we must now treat, since it is this work which has drawn attention to Pomarus in our time.

Saint Isidore of Seville ascribes to him expressly, in addition to the above mentioned dialogue on the soul, another lost treatise, *De virgim-6us instituendis,* and three books " *De futures vitee contemplatione, vel actuali conversatione, necnon de vitiis atque virtutibus* " : such is the treatise De vita contemplativa, as it is usually termed from the title of the first book, and the work which Gennadius seems to mean by *De vitiis et virtutibus,* the title of the third book. This writing, long considered as St. Prosper's is now definitely attributed to Julianus Pomarus 3. The author's protestations of ignorance4 should not be found misleading as they are quite usual in rhetorical writings; further this "unlettered man" was acquainted with Virgil and Cicero; he knew Greek and had read the Stoics; he wrote in a manner "stylish and elegant rather than vigorous"5. He could not have been Prosper but might well have been Pomarus. Moreover, his other ascetic writings show that he was well able to treat such a subject. The attribution of the work is therefore very probable if not absolutely certain : it dates from the last years of Pomarus who died about 498.

A pastoral work, the treatise *De vita contemplativa* was composed at the request of a bishop, Julian of Carpentras, or of Avignon. Julianus undertook the work only after much hesitation 6. The bishop had put to him some ten questions concerning: *a)* the contemplative life and its relation to the active life; *b)* the treatment of sinners and

' He was the master of St. Cæsarius. See M. Chaillan, *S'. Cisaire,* p. 26-28.

3 Ennodius, *Epist.,* 2. and 6.

3 This was first proved by Fr. Sirmond in 1651. The chief arguments are the witness of Gennadius and Isidore. They are borne out by the style.

4 He says he had not read the Doctors: Bk. in, ch. 34.

5L. Valentin, *op. cit.,* p. 653.

6 See the Prologue.

the poor, and abstinence; *c)* lastly, virtues and vices \ Pomarus answered all these questions in the same order as they were proposed and retained the same method in the division of the work into three books. The title, *De vita contemplativa* is chiefly borrowed from the 1st book, but is perfectly suited to the work as a whole, for there is nothing exclusive about the contemplative life as this author conceives it : it supposes and entails the active life. The work is outstanding, not only for the simple elegance of its style but also and above all for the firm moderation used in the treatment of delicate questions, which reveals the prudence and wisdom of years of experience. He was writing for the bishops and the clergy. His originality consisted in teaching the clergy how to combine the contemplative with the active life.

The 1st book, introducing this thesis, comprises two parts. In the *1st part* (ch. M1) Pomarus teaches that the true and perfect contemplative life is to be found only in heaven through the beatific vision (ch. 1-4), although even in this world, really mortified souls obtain through hope an anticipatory participation in spiritual joys ; a participation constituting a veritable contemplative life, although of inferior degree (ch. 5-10)'. *The 2nd part* (ch. 12-25) begins with a magnificent parallel between *contemplative life* and *active life,* both present and future (ch. 12)[3]. The active life *{activa* vel *actualis)* is here taken as signifying all the efforts man must make to overcome his passions, in short, the *ascesis;* but in the rest of the work it also comprises all the priest's pastoral activity in exhorting his flock to the practice of their duties as Christians[4]. In ch. 13 Pomarus declares that priests are able to practise contemplative life in some way in this world, for they can give themselves to contemplation and the meditation of the Scriptures[5],

1 Given by the author at the end of the Prologue.

' Chapter il speaks of the qualities of glorified bodies.

3 This chapter 12 was, for the author, something quite distinct. In any case it forms an admirable transition between the first and the second part.

4 This distinction of the active and the contemplative life is therefore founded less on a manner of life as on states of the soul; that of the soul seeking perfection (active life) and that of the soul possessing and enjoying it (contemplative life). This concept, not so exteriorised as the modern idea, also appears deeper, more formal and more precise. Moreover it makes easier the union of the two lives, for contemplative life brings perfection to active life without suppressing it.

5 Pomarus was acquainted with four opinions on the nature of contemplative life : " Sive secundum opinionem quorumdam, nihil aliud sit vita contemplativa quam rerum latentium futurarumque *notitia,* sive *vacatio* ab omnibus occupationibus mundi, sive divinarum *studium* litterarum, sive, quod his probatur esse perfectius, ipsa *visio Dei,* non video quid impedimenti sanctis sacerdotibus possit afferri, quominus ad hæc quatuor quæ commemoravi, perveniant". The first and the fourth, he says, will be fully attained only in heaven ; but the second and the third can already provide a foretaste of the joys to come.

which, though not vouchsafing the vision of God, prepare the soul to receive a foretaste of it : " Hic quidem velut gustum quemdam cpntemplativæ vitæ, quo ad eam ferventius provocentur, accipiunt". The following chapters (14-24) give the various works of zeal to which priestly activity should devote itself. Pomarus exhorts priests to perform them with perfection, asserting that this very perfection will be the sign and the certain proof that they have attained contemplative life. He concludes, in effect (ch. 25) "Quis sic erit alienus a fide, ut dubitet tales sacerdotes contemplativae virtutis esse participes, quorum exemplo simul ac verbo plures fiunt regnorum cælestium cohæredes ? Isti sunt ministri verbi, adjutores Dei, oraculum Spiritus Sancti ".

Book II gives, in answer to the questions, a wise pastoral teaching regarding the treatment of sinners and the patience necessary in this matter (ch. 1-8) ; on the good use of the possessions of the Church and the beauty of disinterestedness (9-16); last y, on abstinence (17-24).

Book III on *vices* and *virtues* forms an excellent ascetic treatise. It is composed of two parts : one dealing with vices and the remedies thereto (ch. 1-15); the other with virtues (16-34) Pomarus does not speak of the eight capital vices as did the Eastern ascetics and Cassian ; he treats of four; two that are truly capital and the source of all sins, *pride* (1-3) and *cupidity* (4-7) and two less important, *envy* (9) and *vanity* (10). The remedies arc fear (11-12) and better still *charity* (13-15), mother of all virtues. In the part devoted to virtues (16-34), after some generalities (16-18) the author deals with *temperance* (19), *fortitude* (20) and above all *justice* (21-26), three virtues, which, as he sagely remarks, perfect the active life (27); and with regard to the virtue of justice he adds a remarkable chapter that might well have been composed in our own times, on *social virtue* and the duty that incumbs on those who are able to work for the progress of society (28). Pomarus associates prudence with *wisdom* (29-30) : the first seeks truth, the second finds it; both form the rule of the other virtues since they lerfect us in the order of practical reason which guides all our actions : poth are, above all, *gifts of God.* At the end of his book he shows, further, that fear, sorrow, desire and joy arc not vices (31); that many of these affections will be absent in the life to come (32) but that the four moral virtues will remain and come to full perfection (33). Then follows a short general conclusion (34).

I'he teaching of Julianus Pomarus is visibly inspired by Saint Augustine », His doctrine on the contemplative life does not go so far as that of Augustine[2]; but it is no less strongly characterised by a certain *vision of God,* a feeble anticipation of the vision to come, the perfection of faith and charity, the fruit of contemplation and crown of the active life. Like Augustine he reduces the vices to pride and cupidity [3], and their remedies to charity [4]. Similarly he adopts the classical division of the four moral virtues, and

1 See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte,* iv, p. 600.
3 See vol 1, p. 662-664, 686-688, 701. — 3 *Ibid.,* p. 701. — 4 *Ibid.,* p. 700, 702.

particularly stresses prudence and wisdom[1]; he thus forms a close alliance between the contemplative and the active life, and at the end of his work comes back to his starting point. All these traits make of Pomarus a veritable protagonist of an Augustinisin that is wide, moderate and thoroughly practical in form[2]. That of Saint Prosper was utterly different in character.

V. SAINT PROSPER OF AQUITANIA [3]

A) Life and Works of St. Prosper.

Very little is known of Saint Prosper's early life except that he came from Aquitania[4]. He was given a thorough literary and philosophical education which enabled him to write elegantly both in prose and in verse and to acquire a deep and perhaps unrivalled understanding of St. Augustine's ideas. He does not seem however to have known the latter personally. He was in Provence[5] when together with a friend, Hilarius[6],*he denounced in 429 the Semipelagian teachings which were currently taught in the south of Gaul[7]. Shortly after he also explained the question in a letter to one of his friends, *Rufinas*[8]. At length he himself came out in open opposition to the enemies of the Augustinian teaching on grace (whom he called punningly, *ingrati,* in a long poem in 1000 hexameters,

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 701.

[2] Pomarus seems to have been especially inspired by the treatises *De doctrina Christiana* and *De moribus.* See vol. I, p. 653, 624.

[3] Editions : *P. L.*.. 51, (Le Brun des Marelles and Mangeant's ed. 1711). Studies : L. Valentin, 5. *Prosper d'Aquitaine* (thesis, 934 pp.), Paris 1900. L. Couture, *S'. Prosper d'Aq.,* in *Bull. Utt. eccl., 2* art., 1900, 1901. M. Jacquin, *La quest, de la prédest., aux et VL· siècles,* in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1906.(1. vu), p. 269-300. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 283-293. See also *Histoire liti, de la France,* t. Π, p. 369-406. Fessler-Jungmann, *Instit. pair.,* π (2), p. 306-336.

[4] Homo Aquitaniae regionis, says Gennadius, *De viris illusi.,* 84. In early manuscripts he is called *Tuo Prosper* or *Prosper Tiro.* See L. VALENTIN, *op. rii.,* p. 122 sq.

[5] He had frequented the monks and perhaps became a monk himself, possibly at Marseilles. The delightful *Poema conjugis ad uxorem {P. L.,* 51, 611-616). which seems to be quite authentic (See L. Valentín, *op. cit.,* p. 754-766) supposes that he had l>een married, but already in 415, the probable time of this work, he exhorts his wife to devote herself with him entirely to the service of God.

[6] Probably an African, a friend of St. Augustine who knew him personally

[7] See above p. 162 and vol. 1, p. 636. *

[8] *Epistola ad Rufinum de gratia el libero arbitrio. P.* tjj 77.90

De ingratis[1], and his two *Epigrammata in obtrectatorem Augustini*[2]*3:* this detractor seems to have been Cassian. At this period he also appears to have sent to Camillus and Theodore, two priests of Genoa, the explanations of nine passages of St. Augustine's last works which they had asked for; this is the *Pro Augustino responsiones ad excerpta Gcnuensium* 3.

With the death of St. Augustine his adversaries were emboldened and redoubled their attacks, so that Prosper had to become even more active in defence. A travesty of Augustine's ideas was circulated in an anonymous pamphlet of 15 chapters[4]. This was refuted by Prosper in his *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Gallorum calumniantium*[5]. He did more. In order to put an end to this odious campaign he went to Rome where he obtained from *Pope Celestine* in 43!, the letter proclaiming Augustine's orthodoxy and admonishing the episcopate of Gaul to prevent further calumny[6]. However, the pontifical document contained no positive teaching on the matters at issue and did not immediately succeed in bringing peace. On his return to Gaul he was again obliged to refute another and more virulent pamphlet, probably from the pen of *Saint Vincent of Lerins:*[7] according to this author, the Augustinian doctrine " denies that God desires the salvation of all men and that Jesus Christ died for all; it implies that God is the cause of all the evil done by the non-elect as well as their damnation, for He wills this evil and this damnation; they are bound to sin and when they pray God "that His will be done", they pray, in reality, against their own eternal interests[8]9.0 Saint Prosper rejected the majority of these conclusions in his *Pro Augustino respon-siones ad capitula objectionum vineentianarum '.* At length Prosper courageously dared to denounce openly the leader of the opposition ; Cassian, the illustrious author of the " *Collationes ";* he made his accusation about 433-434 in the *Liber contra Collatorem*™, another ample treatment of the relations between grace and freewill. Gradually the quarrel died out. It was not to burst out afresh until the beginning cf the following century.

1 *P. L.*, 51, 91-148. In a short introduction Prosper states the principle that all the good we do comes from grace; he then shows that Pelagianism had been condemned by the popes (1st Part, v. 1-225), and that Semipelagianism is attached to the same error (lind Part., v. 226-564) ; its arguments are extremely weak (mrd P., v. 565-800), and if not identical with Pelagianism, it is very much like it (ivth P., v. 801-1002). See L. Valentin, *of>. cit.*, p. 229-2S8.

3 *P. L.*, 51, 149-152. Two short pieces of 12 to 15 lines.

3 *P. L.* 51,, 1S7-202. — 4 See above p. 165.

s Λ Z., 51, 155-175·

6 See above p. 164.

7 To judge from the *Commonitorium,* 26. See above, p. 170.

8 J Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* nt, p. 284.

9 *P. L.*, 51, 177-186.

10 *De gratia et libero arbitrio liber contra Collatorem; P. L.* 51, 213-276. Some authors think the work was written in 426-430; but it would seem preferable to place the date a few years later.

The defence of Saint Augustine was not Saint Prospers only purpose in studying his works. Even after the Semi-pelagian controversies, he devoted himself more than ever to meditating on his writings, both in Gaul and at Rome. The results of this studious research are found in various Extracts from the works of Saint Augustine. These may be classed under three heads as follows :

a) sayings taken from his writing's and summarising his teaching *(sententiff)* *;

b) sayings combined in the form of distiche *(Epigrammata ex sententiis S. Augustini)* 3;

c) an explanation of Ps. too-150, drawn from the *Enarrationes;* 3 A part of the same work which certainly dealt with the first psalms, is lost.

Saint Prosper was influenced by Saint Augustine in quite another sphere of learning; that of history. He wrote an interesting Chronicle4, of which the first two books (until 378) are no more than a summary and often extracts from the similar works of Eusebius and Saint Jerome; the third book (from 379) is original. His first account ended with the year 445, butin two later revisions he carried it on until 445 and 455 s respectively. This work is *characterised* by its treatment of religious history rather than political events and secular literature, and the greater part is devoted to doctrinal struggles and especially the Pelagian controversies. The author stresses the part played by Saint Augustine as well as that of the Roman Church. This historical narrative, written by a theologian and disciple of Augustine in " the manner of Bossuet" can be appreciated at its true worth only by those really interested in theology6.

Saint Prosper was an intimate of Saint Leo. It is not without grounds that the composition of the *capitula* appended to the monitorium obtained by Prosper from Pope Celestine in 431 is attributed to the latter 7. Later he had another opportunity of knowing Saint Leo, when the latter came on a temporary mission to Gaul, and again when, having been elected pope, Leo returned to Rome (440). It is possible that Prosper followed him there. It has been

' Sententiarum ex op. S. Aug. delibatarum liber (392 sayings), *P. L.,* 51, 427-496.

- *P.* Z., 51, 497-532 (106 pieces, each of several distiche). To all St. Prosper's previously mentioned poems : *Ad uxorem, De ingratis, Epigrammata 2, Epigrammata ex sententiis A.,* must be added a short satirical poem : *Epitaphium pelagians et nesioriame hareseon (P. L.,* 51, 153-154) probably composed just after the Council of Ephesus (431).

3 7'. 51, 277-426. Thus, Saint Prosper's prose works consist of a letter, three treatises *Pro Augustino,* the l)ook *contra Collatorem,* an explanation of the Psalms and the Chronicle of which we have still to speak.

4 7' L·, 51, 535-606. New ed. by Th. Mommsen, in *Mon. Germ. Hist.,* vol. lx, p. 341-499. See L. Valentin, *op. cit.,* p. 411-441.

5 Mommsen distinguishes five revisions.

4 I.. \ AI.ENTIN, *Op. cit.,* p. 416-421. — 7 See above, p. 123 and 164.

supposed that he occupied an important position in the pontifical chancellery, which explains why early writers call him Saint Leo's secretary [1]. He certainly helped the pope in the controversy regarding the date of Easter [2] and continued his favourite studies. From this period, date the collections of sayings from Saint Augustine mentioned above, and the last part of the Chronicle. He died probably about 463, leaving behind him a great reputation for learning and virtue. He was never more than a layman. Although reasons were found in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries for supposing him to have been Bishop of Riez in Provence or of Regium in Lombardy, most historians and critics now look on them as of little value [3]. But his doctrinal authority is not thereby diminished.

B) Saint Prosper's theology.

1° Saint Prosper was above all a theologian. "For him, rhetoric, dialectics, history, poetry, eloquence are the servants ot theology... Of course he was well read, extremely well read; he knew his Virgil as well as the best men of letters of his time; yet he was no literary man. Pie was ignorant ot the tricks of the professional writer; he gave no thought to appearing original" [4]. He did not lack imagination; but he shone more especially by the clarity of his ideas, his force in argument, and his skill in reducing a false teaching to a few propositions which he then proceeded to destroy methodically [5]. He wrote verse with elegance and ease and on subjects little adapted to poetical expression [6]. But he was too much the theologian to be an eminent poet. His

1 Gennadius at any rate attributed to him explicitly *(De vins ill.·,* 84) Saint Leo's letters against Eutyches, but only on hearsay *(dicuntur)* of which it is not easy to be sure.

2 He also composed a Paschal cycle (not extant). It was his last writing, There is a fairly large number of works wrongly ascribed to Saint Prosper : the *Auctoritates* (see p. 164), the *De vita contemplativa* (see p. 181), the *De vocatione omnium gentium* (see p. 176), a *Liber de promissionibus et praedictionibus,* a so called *Imperial Chronicle* and a poem *De Providentia.* See L. Valentin, *Op. cit.,* p. 651-838, for all these works.

3 See L. Valentin, *op. cit.,* p. 140-148. Saint Gelasius and Gennadius who are careful to give to every author his proper title, give none to Prosper. Similarly no author mentions his episcopate until the twelfth century. The notion that he was Bishop of Riez or Reggio was Eased, in the face of almost insurmountable historical difficulties, on an early manuscript.

4 L. Valentin, *op. cit.,* 400-410. — 5 *Ibid.,* 409.

6 *Ibid.,* 564-606. Saint Prosper, as poet of grace, was imitated by L. Racine (Le poème de la grâce). See *ibid.,* p. 663 646.

was the oratorical style [*], and in many ways he shows himself to have been a disciple of the rhetors [a]. He was also largely inspired by the Bible [3].

The teaching of Saint Prosper was scarcely new : he deliberately desired to be no more than an echo of Saint Augustine and this, on the whole, he achieved. His theology of grace [4] was exactly that of the Bishop *of* Hippo : *a)* Against the Semipelagians he energetically affirmed the *radical impotency of nature to beoin the work of salvation* [5], and considered as (relatively) evil all actions of this nature when deprived of faith [6] : *b)* for him, grace is a force which not only *rules,* but also *acts on* (moves) the will [7] which operates " in us and with us" so as to provoke our operation [8] ; *c)* grace is not offered *equally {indifferenter)* to all since in reality not all hear the Gospel preached, and among those who do hear some understand, while others accept it in a purely material way [9].

2° Saint Prosper's doctrine is chiefly found in the course of his defence of Saint Augustine's teaching against the false and biased interpretations given by the *Capitula Gallorum* and the *Objectiones vincentianœ* [10]. The difficulties are centred around two main points : God's will to save all men, and Predestination.

a) Saint Augustine, basing himself on the revealed fact that all men are not saved, frequently spoke of God's *limited* will to save all [n]. From one aspect this is a true affirmation, doubtless risky and even dangerous in many ways, but one that may well have been necessary at one time. Saint Prosper constantly clung to this point of view. No doubt he wrote: "Sincerissime credendum atque profitendum est Deum velle ut omnes homines salvi fiant [12] ". But, as Tixeront [x3] remarks " Even in this passage he implies that

[1] *Ibid.,* 531-543. — [2] *Ibid.,* 543-554. — [3] *Ibid.,* 531.

[4] J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 285-293. See p. 164 note.

[5] See all the controversial writings already mentioned, chiefly the *Contra Collatorem.*

[c] Intelligat justitiam infidelium non esse justitiam, quia sordet natura sine gratia. *Epist. ad Ruf.,* VII, 8. See vol. I, p. 699.

[7] Plus est procul dubio agi quam regi. Qui enim regitur aliquid agit... qui autem agitur agere ipse aliquid vix intelligitur, *Sentent.,* 312. Expression to be explained by the following.

[6] *Sent. 22.* Aguntur homines ut agant, said Saint Augustine : cf. vol. I, p. 684.

[9] *Resp. ad capita Gallorum,* V.

[■] !.. Valentin claims that these writings really reproduce the ideas of Saint Augustine, whose very words they employ *((op. cit.,* p. 294, 303). " This opinion is inadmissible, says Fr. Jacquin, for though there is similarity of terminology, the meaning is not the same in die two cases" *(op. cit.,* n. 278-280). — [11] Sec vol. I, p. 692.

[11] *Resp. ad cap. obi. vincent., 2.* — [*3] *Hist. Do^m.,* HI, p. 228.

there are exceptions and that God has reasons for making them that we are unable to grasp" ».

Prosper again repeats these general expressions in a particular sense when he writes of the effects of the Redemption. If the Incarnation is considered, Christ died for all, since in Him is found human nature the same as in all men, except for sin; in this nature Christ suffered and was crucified. But if it is considered that many do not profit by His death, it can be said that Christ did not die for them, since in fact the Redemption is not applied to them'. This practical viewpoint must be carefully observed if these expressions are not to be misinterpreted.

b) As regards Predestination properly" so called, Saint Prosper also retains the ideas of Saint Augustine. He will not identify predestination with *foreknowledge,* for God's attitude is not the same in relation to the good and evil actions which he equally' foresees; but although he foresees the latter He does not produce them, though He is the author of all the good in man, who can do nothing without Him. Thus, predestination supposes, together with foreknowledge, the will to produce, in and through man, this good 3 which leads to glorification and to glory 4. Thus Saint Prosper admits the gratuity of predestination but not of reprobation, which is a consequence of the foreknowledge of evil. Further, he maintains the practical point of view 5 that was Augustine's 6; like the latter he distinguishes the good which is imputed to God, and evil that can come only from man 7, and he admits that predestination, far from destroying free will, makes it on the contrary more perfect. On one point however, that of reprobation, Prosper sensibly attenuates his master's teaching 8.

* Elsewhere St. Prosper says : " Item qui dicit quod non omnes homines vult Deus salvos fieri sed certum numerum praedestinatorum, *durius loquitur quam loquendum est* de altitudine immutabilis grati» Dei, qui et omnes vult salvos fieri et in agnitionem veritatis venire. " *(Contia capit. gall.,* u, ch. vili). VALENTIN takes the text in the meaning of *voluntas universalis (op. cit.,* p. 390). For the contrary interpretation, see Jacquin *(op. cit.,* 282-284), who translates *durius...* by : " he speaks more rigorously than it is proper to speak ".

3 *Resp. ad cap. Gall.,* I. P., ch. IX. Cf. JACQUIN, *op. cit.,* p. 285.

3 *Resp. ad cap. Gall.,* I, 15; II, 15.

4 Saint Prosper never completely separates the two effects of predestination, grace and glory : he envisages *adequate* predestination. See above p. 177 and vol. I, p. 690, note.

5 See *Resp. ad cap. Gall.,* I, 13.

fi Moreover he considered it from a very general viewpoint, that of the *massa damnata* for instance, so that children were included.

7 *Resp. ad cap. Gall.,* I, 15·

8 *Ibid.,* 6.

c} Like Augustine he considers that the predestination of the elect is gratuitous, but he thinks that reprobation is a consequence of personal sins foreseen by God. Saint Augustine, intent on safeguarding God's independence and thus explaining the loss of children dying unbaptised, insisted on its gratuity; not only is the choice of the elect gratuitous, but the abandonment of the non-elect is independent of personal merit ; the latter can put forward no just claim to be saved, since by birth, all men are part of the *massa perditionis,* and further, the mystery of the divine wisdom is impenetrable '. For these arguments which sufficed for Augustine, Saint Prosper, adopting in part his adversaries' ideas, substituted the distinction between *predestination* which is gratuitous and *reprobation* which is dependent on the foreseeing of evil[3]. This distinction is judicious but insufficient (for instance the case of unbaptised children). It would have been more in keeping with Augustinism to distinguish explicitly between *non-election* or negative reprobation[3] and *reprobation* properly so called, i. e., the preparation of punishment for personal sins. Such a distinction, however, was difficult for a theologian who, lacking any precise teaching on Limbo[4], had to admit some punishment, even for infants, and assimilate non-election to damnation. Later theology corrected and completed Saint Augustine's teaching on this subject.

Another attempt to temper the Augustinian teaching is found in the treatise *De vocatione omnium gentium**, written between 430 and 460 and sometimes attributed to Saint Prosper. The author, like a true Augustinian desired at the same time to justify the ways of God, explain the reprobation of many, and maintain the gratuity of salvation. He admitted the will of God to save all men and insisted on a *general* grace of salvation offered to all; further he distinguished an absolutely gratuitous *special grace*[6] given to those who are actually saved. But when he came to explain why' this special grace is accorded to one rather than another, he obviously had to fall back on the mystery of the divine wisdom 7.

1 See vol. 1, p. 693.

2 According to Jacquin, *op cit.,* p. 286 and 298, there was an evolution in Prosper's ideas on this subject, since before 430 he admitted the *massa damnata.*

3 Independently oí personal demerits, and in this sense, as gratuitous as predestination itself.

4 See below, p. 198.

s *P. L.y* 51, 647-722, *Libri II de vocatione omn. gentium.* See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*. tn, p. 292-293.

6 Quibus donis (dona generalia...) specialis gratiæ largitas superfusa est : Bk. 11, 25.

▮ To this treatise may be compared the *Hypotnneslicon (Memoratorittm) contra pelagianos et calcstianos,* also called *Hypognosticon (Subnotationes),* in 6 books, wrongly attributed to Saint Augustine, *P. L.,* 45, 1611-1664.

VI. SAINT FULGENTIUS OF RUSPE*.

A) Life (468-533) and works of Saint Fulgentius.

In an Africa ravaged by a whole century of occupation by the Vandals and oppression by the Arians, we find another great disciple of Saint Augustine in the person of Saint Fulgentius. The kingdom of the Vandals was founded in the very year of Augustine's death 430;. It disappeared in the year of Saint Fulgentius' death, after he had been a witness and victim of the last persecutions. On political grounds if not on those of personal conviction, *Genserie* (428-477) and his successor *Hunneric* (477-484) made war on Catholicism, sometimes violently, sometimes in an underhand but not less dangerous manner. After Gunthamund's tolerant rule (484-496), the old Arian policy of hostility towards the Church was resumed by Thrasamund (496-523) first mildly and then with violence. The Catholic monks were subjected to various petty persecutions and in a greater measure also the hierarchy, which lhe king endeavoured to suppress by forbidding fresh consecrations and finally in 5(0 by exiling to Sardinia the remaining sixty bishops. Of these, Saint Fulgentius was the most outstanding by his reputation for learning and virtue, and the importance of his see and the antiquity of his office[2].

Io Life before the episcopate. Saint Fulgentius [3], born about 468, belonged to a rich and noble Carthaginian family, which, though first despoiled of its possessions by the Vandals, had recovered some of its property and settled at Telepte in Byzacena [4]. His father died early and it was to his mother he owed his thorough Christian and literary upbringing. While still young he became procurator of the *fiscus,* but his time was only half occupied by this work. He spent much of his leisure in company of the monks and admired their mode of life. At last he was moved by reading St. Augustine's sermon on Psalm 36 [5] to enter the

* Edition : *P. L.,* 65, (Mangeant's edit. 1684). Studies : P. Godet, *Fulgente (S.)* in *Did. thiol.,* 968-972. Fessler-JUNGMANN, *Instil, patrol.,* n, 2, P· 39S-432· M.-A. GuiLLON, *S. Fulgente de Ruspe* (biographical study) in *Rev. August.,* 1906 (vol. Vin), p. 129-144. F. Woerter, *Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semi-Pelagianismus,* Munster, 1899, p. 107-155. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 299-304. See also Ceillier, *Hist. ant. eccl.,* xvi, 1-140 (2nd ed., XI, 1-76). E. PORTALIÉ, *Augustinisme,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 2521.

2 The account of the terrible Vandal persecution is to be found in the *History* of Victor of Vita. See below, p. 228. Cf. Aug. Audollent, *Afrique,* in *Did. Hist.,* col. 810-833.

3 Saint Fulgentius' life is fairly well known thanks to an early biography *(P. I..,* 65, 117-150) attributed to Fulgentius Ferrandus (See below, p. 227). There is an excellent summary of this *Vita* by M.-A. Guu.lon, *op. cit.*

4 Byzacena was the southern part of modern Tunis, as far as Gabes. Telepte was in the west, near the present province of Constantine.

5 In the *Enarrationes,* St. Augustine devoted three long sermons to I's. *f>. D I..,* 36, 354-39V

religious life, in spite of his mother's tears [x]. He was soon made *co-abbot* and on several occasions was forced to fly, together with his monks, from Moorish raids and Arian persecution. About 500 he decided to visit Egypt to see the monasteries in which he had become interested through reading Cassian; having got as far as Sicily however, he gave up his project on learning of the spread of Monophysitism in Egypt. On his return to Africa he founded a new monastery and soon was made a priest in spite of his reluctance, and shortly afterwards *Bishop of Ruspe* in the east of Byzacena on the coast. He was about forty years old (508). In a short time he was to become one of the most illustrious African Catholic bishops under the Vandal domination.

At that time the Catholic episcopate had furnished learned and courageous advocates for the defence of the faith, especially against the Arians. The most famous of those who have left writings to posterity was Vigilius of Thapsusa, Bishop of Byzacena, one of the most outstanding Catholic members of the pseudo-conference of Catholics and Arians convoked by Hunneric in 484 so that he might find an opportunity of expelling those bishops who would not conform to the official religion. Of his numerous controversial works there remain only a dialogue against the Arians[3] and a treatise against Eutyches[4]. Eugenius, the intrepid Bishop of Carthage (480-505) in those troublous times[5], addressed a symbol of the Catholic faith to the king after the conference of 484. He also left to his fellow townsmen a *Letter* exhorting them to keep the faith[6].* Other adversaries of Arianism in Africa are mentioned by Gennadius; *Asclepius'l, Voconius**, and chiefly *Victor of Cartenna.* A letter and a treatise on penance by the latter are probably authentic[9]. The deserving historian of Byzacena, *Victor of Vita* should also be mentioned [10]. Yet all these great and good men are eclipsed by Saint Fulgentius who was at one and the same time the adversary of Arianism, a doctor of grace and a very zealous pastor of souls.

2° The Arian Controversies. Banished from his diocese in the second or third year of his episcopate, Fulgentius was not long in becoming the leader of the *exiled bishops in*

l Vita, n. 11-12.

3 Chifflet's edit., Dijon, 1664; in Z*. *L.,* 62, 95-544· Study: G. Ficker, *Stlidien zu Vigilius von Thapsus,* Leipsic, 1S97. —*3 P. L.,* 62, 155-179.

4 *Ibid..* 95-155. The other published writings are apocryphal.

5 He died exiled in Gaul, at Albi (505). — 6 *I'. L.,* 58, 769-771.

' Gennadius, *De vins ill.,* 73. —8 *Ibid.,* 78.

' *Ibid..* The letter to Basil *De consolatione in adversis P. G.,* 31, 16S7-1704 f*inter op. S. Bas.),* and the *De pernitentia P. L.,* 17, 971-1004 *(interop. S. Ambrosii).*

10 See below, p. 228.

Sardinia [1]. His renown having come to the ears of Thrasimund he could not contain his desire to hear and argue with him.

The Arian king had him brought to Carthage where ten questions were put to him. The bishop made a written *answer* which is still extant[2]. The king then put fresh objections to Fulgentius who replied in a long treatise to the monarch *(Ad Trasimundum, libri tres)*[3]. In the first book he deals with the Incarnation rather than the Trinity, for he considered the former as the real starting point of the Arian error. In the second book he answers the objections based on the immensity of God, and in the third, those arising from the Passion of Our Lord.

The Arian bishop, *Pinta,* having attempted to refute Fulgentius, was answered in another treatise, now lost[4]. Against *Fabian,* another Arian bishop, he wrote no less than ten books : fairly considerable portions of this work[5] are extant but it is lost as a whole. On the other hand we still possess the complete refutation of a sermon by the Arian bishop *Fastidiosus*[6] which one of Fulgentius' correspondents, Bishop Victor, had asked him to write[7].

Saint Fulgentius' teaching as a whole, in addition to his Trinitarian and Christological doctrine, is best expressed in the two theological opuscula entitled *De Trinitate* and *De fide* :[8] the first is a succinct explanation of the essential dogmas of the Church ; the second is an excellent summary of the whole of Christian doctrine, which may be compared with Saint Augustine's *Enchiridion.* In the first part of the work the explanations are fairly lengthy (n. 1-44); in the second (45-85), the doctrine is condensed in the form of propositions or rules (of which there are 40) which invariably begin with the expression : *Firmissime lene et nullatenus dubites.*

Several of these writings seem to have been composed after Fulgentius had left Carthage, and were perhaps wholly written in exile. Fulgentius' stay in Carthage had finally offended the Arian clergy and about 520 Thrasimund sent him back to Sardinia. It was there that he was called upon to treat the most important doctrinal question of grace.

[1] Sardinia, as well as Corsica, Sicily and the Balearic Islands was occupied by the Vandals in the time of Genserie.

[2] *Responsiones contra arianos : P. L.*, 65, 205-224.

[3] *P. L.,* 65, 223-304.

[4] The *Adversus Pintam,* edited in *P. L.,* 65, 707-720 is not authentic.

[5] *P. L.*, 65, 750-834 (39 fragments).

[6] *P. L.,* 65, 507-528. — [7] *Epist.* 9.

[8] The complete titles of these opuscula are : *Ad Felicem notarium, De Trinitate, P. L.,* 65, 497-508; *De fide ad Petrum seu De regula vera fidei, P. L.,* 65, 671-706. The opusculum *De Incarnatione Filii Dei et vilium animalium auctore ad Scarilam, P. L.,* 65, 573-583 explains to Scarila that the Word alone was made flesh (n. 1-23) and that God could create even harmful beasts (24-56). Only two small fragments of the work *De Spiritu Sancto* are extant, *P. L.,* 65, 833-834.

3« Writing's on grace. Other works. The writings of Faustus of Riez gave rise to this controversy on grace. The work of the Semipelagian bishop on grace and predestination 1 which in forty years had scarce caused any stir, at last came to Constantinople shortly before 520 and fell into the hands of the *Scythian monks* 2. These were astonished at the teaching they found therein and through the intermediary of the African bishop Possessor, then in exile at Constantinople, asked Rome what authority attached to Faustus' writings. To Possessor Hormisdas replied 3 that this author's writings had no authority *(neque illum recipi..* J, but that the doctrine on grace was to be found in the works of Augustine and Prosper and also in the decisions of the Church (probably the 10 chapters appended to Celestine's letter in 431) 4 and the works of Saint Paul. The spokesman of the Scythian monks, Joannes Maxentius, whose misdirected zeal had been blamed by the pope, was dissatisfied with this answer and impudently reproached the pope with not formally forbidding a work of whose teaching he did not approves. Nor did the monks content themselves with this outspoken retort. About 520, four of them, then present in Rome, begged the favour of the Holy See for the formula they considered apt for the solution of the Christological controversy. They put themselves in communication with the African bishops, friends of Possessor exiled in Sardinia, to whom they dispatched a memorandum explaining their own teaching, not only on the Christological question but also on grace, and in particular condemning Faustus of Riez. Fifteen bishops asked Fulgentius to reply to this document.

These defenders of Augustine were approved by Fulgentius in a *letter* which became the little treatise entitled *Liber de Incarnatione et gratia Domini Nostri Jesu Christi* Later, on his return to Africa after 523 he wrote *another letter* on the same subject in the name of a synod of twelve bishops 7. Meanwhile he had composed several other works.

* See above p. 172.
' See above p. 73. See J. Tixeroxt, *Itisi. Dogai.*, m, p. 297-300.
3 *Epist.* 70 (13th Aug. 520). — 4 See above, p. 164.
5 *P.* G., 86. I, 93-112 *(Ad epistolam Hormisdæ responsio}.*
6 *Epist.* 17; *P. L.,* 65, 451-493·
' *Epist.,* 15; *P. L.,* 65, 435-442· It was sent to the Archimandrite and Driest Joannes (Maxentius) and to the deacon Venerius. H

The refutation of Faustus of Riez in seven books, which is the most important, is now lost, but there remains the treatise **Jr/** *Minimum* r, the first book of which treats of predestination, and another work on the same subject *De veritate prædestinationis et gratiæ*2, in 3 books, written in Africa and dedicated to Joannes and Venerius 3. These writings furnish us with an exact idea of his teaching on this difficult subject. We shall speak of it again.

After the death of Thrasimund (523)4, Fulgentius was able to return to his diocese and devote himself to his pastoral duties for another ten years. His *De remissione peccatorum ad Euthymium* s, was written during his exile. It is a pastoral as well as a doctrinal work (it chiefly deals with the Providential conditions of salvation; faith, good works, the length of the present life) and shows that his zeal for the sanctification of his flock equalled his love of orthodoxy. His two opuscula *On Fasting* and *On Prayer* are no longer extant, unless one of them happens to be the second letter to Proba *(De oratione ct compunctione6).* Saint Fulgentius' *letters* (13 are extant7, of which several are fairly long and form veritable little treatises) also bear witness to his practical activity: seven deal with moral questions; the six others deal with dogma. There are extant only sonie ten authentic sermons 8 on the feasts of Our Lord and the saints, and various moral questions : the other eighty that have been attributed to him are by Saint Augustine, Saint Peter Chrysologus and unknown orators9. Lastly we must mention Saint Fulgentius' ardour in preaching monachism as a means of Christian perfection, in the manner of Saint Augustine : he always lived as a monk, before and after his elevation to the episcopate and even in exile ,0.

In the last year of his life together with some of the brothers, he retired to a more isolated monastery on an island, there to occupy himself wholly in prayer ". The pleas of his dock obliged him to return to his diocese, where he died in 533, the year in which the kingdom of the Vandals fell under the blows of Belisarius. Hilderic (523-530) had left the Church in peace, and his successor had

' *P. L.,* 65, 151-206: Bk. i (153-178) on predestination; Bk. IT, (179-196) on sacrifice, the mission of the Holy Ghost, and virginity, according to St. Paul; Bk. in (195-206) on *Verbum erat apud Denin.* Monimus was an Augustinian with predestinarían leanings.

* /'. Á., 65, 603-672. — 3 To whom the synodal letter was sent., *Epist.* 15.

4 Thrasimund had made his son Hilderic swear that he would not recall the exiled bishops *after* his death : but Hilderic anticipated and annulled Thrasimund' decrees while he still lived.

5 /'. 65, 527-574 (in two books). — 6 *Epist.* IV.

7 There are 18 in the collection *[P. L.,* 65, 305-498), but five of these are letters received by him.

8 *P. L.,* 65, 719-750· — 9 z'· 65, 855-954.

,0 *Vita,* XXVII, 51-53- — *' xx*x, 62.

neither the time nor the leisure to carry out his plans of persecution.

B) Saint Fulgentius the Doctor. His teaching.

Bossuet called Saint Fulgentius a " great doctor " and saw in him " the greatest theologian and the most saintly bishop of his time " [1]. Undoubtedly the Bishop of Ruspe cannot be compared, either as regards his style or his matter, with the foremost doctors of the preceding period. Though his style is clear, it is not of the purest, and his facility often makes him tedious. Further, although his thought was vigorous and incisive, he was not a very original thinker, or at least did not attempt to be such ; his ambition was to discover in the works of his revered master Saint Augustine, the revealed deposit as transmitted by the Scriptures and Tradition. He has thus been called an *Augustinus abbreviatas.* He was, in fine, an eminent disciple of the Bishop of Hippo, one of those of whom Bossuet said "The disciples of Saint Augustine were the masters of the world " [2].

The doctrine of grace and predestination, is not, as is too easily' thought, the central point of Saint Fulgentius' theological teaching, but rather the *Trinitarian and Christological doctrine :* apart from the controversies, this is shown clearly enough by the treatise *De fide ad Petrum.* 1'he more lengthy developments of both parts are devoted to these two mysteries whilst the other points are summarised in a few principles[3]. In this way Saint Fulgentius remains truly faithful to Augustinian thought which especially gives its attention to the perfections of God and to each divine Person in particular, and especially the Incarnate Word*». The doctrine on grace and predestination is but the consequence and application of these principle data. Nevertheless, since this doctrine is full of nice distinctions and may easily give rise to biased interpretation it must be treated

1 *Défense de la Tradition el des saints es,* Bk. I, ch. 14.

' /¿>*id.t* Bk. V, ch. 21.

3 It is flagrantly unjust and ridiculous to picture the Augustinians as being wholly absorbed by the problem of predestination and anxious to find the solution of it alone; all the more so since, in fact, they regarded this question not as a problem but as a truth, not perhaps directly revealed, but as contained more or less in the doctrine of the gratuity of grace ; a doctrine that is one of the characteristics of Augu^tinism.

4 See vol. I,p. 672-678. Cf. p. 693-694, 662-664.

here in some detail, with an exact appreciation of Saint Fulgentius' point of view in the question of predestination.

Saint Fulgence subscribed to all of Saint Augustine's teaching on grace, and even those personal opinions which were discarded by later theology. He considered the human race as a *massa damnata* [1] on account of original sin, which he calls *originale peccatum, parentalis macula* [2]; so far he shares a common doctrine; [3] but like his master [3], he also believed that original sin is transmitted by concupiscence in the generative act [4], and that this sin is punished by the pain of the senses in unbaptised children [5]. Fallen man still keeps his freewill [6]* but his will is weakened and must have *grace* in order to will supernatural good [7]: left to itself it cannot even desire this good [8,9] just as the fallen angel was unable to repent, so fallen man possesses no supernatural good except by grace [9]; the latter operates in man or cooperates with him accordingly as it precedes or accompanies the act of will [10]. It follows that this grace is absolutely *gratuitous* [11], and that is undoubtedly the outstanding point of Saint Fulgentius' theology of grace: man cannot merit the first supernatural aids; God grants them to whom He wills to grant them, purely out of His goodness and mercy.

Saint Fulgentius goes further still and does not hesitate to follow Saint Augustine by stressing the eternal preparation of these graces in view of future glorification. In brief, he makes his own, all the great doctor's teaching on predestination. It should be noted, however that he speaks of *total* predestination *{adequate sunifita}*: this of course entails predestination to glory; but a glory that far from being considered independently of faith and grace, is always shown as being their effect and complement: "Et vocationis nostræ initia, et justificationis augmenta, et glorificationis præmia in praedestinatione semper Deus habuit" [12].

[1] *De verit. piad.,* Bk. ch. ni, 7.
[3] *Defide,* reg. 23, η. 67; *De veril, prua.,* Bk. 1, eh. Ili, 7.
[3] See voi. 1, p. 679.
[4] *De fide,* reg. 23, n. 67. *De verit. prad.,* I, n. 3, 7. *Eptst.* 17, n. 26, 28. It is possible that this doctrine is here more clearly set out than in St Augustine.
[5] *Defide,* reg. 24, n. 68.
De verit. firad., Bk. 11, n. 3, 4, 5, 8, etc.
[»] *Ibid.,* Bk. η, n. 6.
[8] *Ibid.,* Bk. I, n. 33-38; Bk. II, 12-18.
[9] *Ad. Monim.,* Bk, I, VIH, ix. The effect of pride in man after the fall vitiates all his actions from the point of view of merit.
[,0] *Ibid.* X, XI.
["] *Ibid.,* XIV, and *passim.*
[n] *Ad Monim.,* 1, ch. xi.

This explicit declaration corresponds to the whole of the first Book to Monimus and to the *De ventate preedestinationis* and makes it clear why Fulgentius, like Saint Augustine [1], connects predestination with the judgment in his *De fide* [2]. On the one hand this total predestination is *gratuitous* since grace, without which man is powerless in things supernatural, is a gift of God's mercy;[3] on the other hand it is *certain.* by virtue of the omnipotence of God;[4] lastly, it is *limited* to a part of mankind; that part which has been called to show forth eternally the merciful goodness of God[5]. This latter teaching is based on the incontrovertable dogmatic fact that throughout eternity there will exist a city of the lost, as well as a city of the elect. But this gives rise to a twofold problem concerning the will of God and the fate of the chosen.

Like Saint Augustine, Saint Fulgentius kept before his eyes the dogmatic fact we have just mentioned and did not hesitate in affirming that God does not will all men to be saved[6]. Although the necessity of this assertion was especially useful in Saint Augustine's time, when the Origenists denied the eternity of hell in the name of the divine goodness, it was perhaps less urgent in the time of Fulgentius. It may easily have been misunderstood, since it was based on a somewhat unilateral outlook and did not sufficiently take into account what later theology has termed the antecedent will concerning the salvation of mankind: this is universal and extends to all men [7].

Saint Fulgentius admitted predestination, in the proper meaning of the word, only for the elect. As for the damned, predestination meant at the most predestination to *punishment.* Monimus having interpreted St. Augustine too literally and desiring to make a parallel between the elect and the lost, tried to persuade Fulgentius of the latters' jredestination to sin and consequently to punishment[8]. Fulgentius lowever would not admit this[9]; while claiming that the call of some to salvation and the leaving of others to their fate was a mystery[10], he explained the justice of this abandonment either by original sin or by the pride which is its consequence and which renders sterile all actions, even the best in appearance". Doubtless this does not solve all difficulties: but it possesses at least the advantage of being based on an actual fact, known by faith, *i. e.,* the existence of original sin.

There is no doubt that Saint Fulgentius like his mentor, went too far in teaching that original sin alone in children was punished by' the pain of the senses [12], and by so doing he gave an appearance of bitter cruelty to a theological

[1] See vol. I. p. 691. — [2] *Defide,* reg. 27-32.

[3] *De veril prad.,* all the first book. — [4] *Ad Afonitn.,* Bk. I, ch. 12.

[5] These are the *vasa misericordia,* constantly opposed to the *vasa ira: Ad Mcnim.,* Bk. 1, Ch. XXVI; *De ver. prad.,* Bk. 11, Ch. XXj *De fide,* reg. 32. *Epist.* XV, 14, etc.

[6] *De veril. prad.,* in, 14. 15, 17-22. *Ep.* XV, 15: XVII, 61-66. He interprets St. Paul* s *Omnes homines vult salvos fieri* (1 *Tim.* II, 4) as did St. Augustine. (See vol. I, p. 692) — [7] See above, p. 177.

[8] *Ad Monim.,* Bk. I, ch. xvn sq. —[9] *Ibid.,* Bk. I, ch. IV-VII, XVH-XXX.

[10] But this fate was not created by God: " Aut istum prorsus indignum misericordia praeveniat, aut illum ira dignum inveniat". *Ibid.,* I, ch. vn.

[11] *Ibid.,* 1, ch. XVU sq. — [12] *Mitissima,* said St. Augustine. See vol. i, p. 6S0.

system that was meant above all to bear witness to the merciful goodness of God L The attitude of Augustine and his disciples is to be explained perhaps by the vagueness of contemporary teaching on original sin, and especially by reaction against Pelagius who affirmed that all unbaptised children went to heaven2; and lastly, by the lack of any very explicit traditional teaching regarding Umbo 3. The theology of this latter question hardly reached any precision before the time of St. Thomas 4, although the first outlines are found in preceding doctors and even in the writings of some Augustinians. In the absence of this doctrine, Augustine did not hesitate to formulate a severe opinion in order to preserve the certain teaching of the faith

CHAPTER XVI.

Saint Caesarius of Arles (470-543).

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions: *P. L.*, 39 *and* 67 *(Inter Apoc. S. Augustini). Mon. germ. hist.*. 1896, in, 433-501. I). Morin, in ÁVía *bénéd.*, 1896, 1899, 1906. Cf. P. Lejay, *Notes bibliogr. sur S. Césaire,* in *Rev. Hist. Litt, rei.,* 1905 (t. x) p. 183-188.

2. Studies : A. Malnory, *.S'. Césaire* (thesis), Paris, 1894. M. Chaillan, 5. *Césaire* (Coll. *Les Saints'),* Paris, 1921. C. F. ARNOLD, *Casarius v. Arelate,* Leipsic, 1894. P. Lejay, *Le rôle théologique de S. Césaire,* in *Rev. Hist. Litt, rei.,* 1905 (t. x), 4 articles. J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Dogm.,* 111, p. 304-312. I L Grisar, *Hist, de Rome et des papes,* II, p. 65-70. P. Lejay, *Césaire d'Arles,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2168-2185.

I. LIFE AND WORKS OF SAINT CÆSARIUS.

IIIS PASTORAL WORK.

A) Bishop and Primate.

Cæsarius was born at Chalon-sur-Saône in 470 or 471. His family was wealthy and probably' of Gallo-Roman

l *An* effort to maintain the gratuity of grace and consequently the goodness of God Who vouchsafes it. — ' See vol. 1, p. 391-392.

3 Some of the Fathers favoured the idea of a separate destiny for those who die in original sin alone : thus Athenagoras, St. Greg. Naz., St. Greg, of Nyssa, Ambrosiaster. Sec A. Gaudbl, *Limbes,* in *Diet, thiol.,* 761 sq.

* *In It Sent.,* D. xxxni, q. Il, a. 2; n. xi.v, q. 1, a. 2: chiefly *De Malo,* q. 5, a. 2-3. Cf. Ga UDEL, *ibid.,* col. 768 sq.

extraction. When he was eighteen he gave up the pleasant worldly life he had been leading and entered the ranks of the clergy of Chalón and two years later retired to *Levins.* Later he left the holy island, apparently on account of his health, and went to Arles about 495 where he was able to follow the lectures of Pomarus. He did not become a great classical scholar; at least he learned to write easily; to compose and produce his periods according to the rules of the *cursus,* says Lejay [1]. It was here in all likelihood that he grew to know and love St. Augustine's teaching[2] and to acquire his essential ideas on the doctrine of grace. Incardinated in the clergy of Arles, he was made a priest about 498-499 and set at the head of a monastery[3] in an island of the Rhone, probably that of Pomarus [4]. Three years later he became Bishop of Arles (about 503). Saint Cæsarius governed this see for forty years (d. 543). But he wielded his *influence* even outside his own diocese: "When he died on the 27th August 543, says Lejay, he left behind him a lasting work that enables him to be considered as one of the founders of the Church of France" [5].

The Arlesian primacy was in part responsible for St. Cæsarius' wide activities. This primacy "chiefly consisted in a general supervision of the ecclesiastical affairs in Gaul and Spain, the convocation of councils and the privilege of delivering sealed credentials to the clergy and bishops going from these countries to the pope" [6]. But it was above all in his own character that he found the strength to carry out the obligations of his charge to the profit of the Churches, in spite of the difficulties of the *political situation.* At the opening of the sixth century Arles was a dependence of the Arian *Visigoth* princes, masters of the south of Gaul, who looked on Cæsarius with suspicion: he was forced to go to Bordeaux in order to clear himself and returned fully satisfied with the results of his visit (505). The *Ostrogoth* government from 508 to 536 was likewise Arian. Theodoric (d. 526) summoned the Bishop of Arles to Ravenna (513) but dismissed him covered with honours and recognised all the spiritual privileges of his see [7]. With this welcome support Cæsarius was able henceforth to convoke and preside councils without hindrance. When Provence was annexed to the *Frankish*

[1] *Diet, thiol.,* col. 2169.

He must already have studied it at J,erins, in the mitigated form taught by Faustus of Riez the great doctor of the monastery.

[2] About this time he probably wrote his first rule *for the monks.* See p. 207. Cf. M. Chaillan, *op. cit.,* p. 31 sq.

[4] *In instila suburbana civitatis.* Situation unknown today, perhaps Camargue near the Rhone and the town. M. Chaillan, *op. cit.,* p. *30.

[5] *Diet, thiol.,* col. 2170.

[6] *Diet, thiol.,* col. 2169.

[7] Privileges that were disputed by St. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne.

kingdom of Childebert in 536, the fate of the primacy of Arles was again in the balance, but by means of councils, especially that of Orleans (538 and 541) the great bishop's legislative work and influence was extended to yet fresh fields [*].

The councils in which Saint Cæsarius played an important part were numerous : *Agde* (506), Arles (524), Carpentras (527), *Orange (529),* Vaison (529), Marseilles (533)'. Of these the most famous was that of *Orange* (529) whose doctrinal definitions were eventually adopted by Rome and became a universal rule of faith[3]. But neither must we forget the Council of *Agde* (506) whose disciplinary canons have in part entered into the *Corpus Juris,* and which must be compared with another very important disciplinary work i. e., the 104 canons, *said* to be of the IVth council of Carthage (council supposed to have taken place in 398, but which, says Hefele, in all likelihood never existed)[4]. This collection is termed more exactly in early manuscripts *Statuta Ecclesiæ antiqua.* It is doubtless due to Cæsarius and may be considered as " his first attempt ; a work by which he preluded in somewhat troublous times to the more pacific work of the great council of Agde in 506"[5]. To these first attempts may be compared the *Rules* that Cæsarius drew up for the government of the monks and nuns of his diocese[6].

B) The preacher.

The most characteristic part of his pastoral activities is to be found in his preaching. He never tired of urging his people to the practice of their religious duties. All Saint Cæsarius' sermons are not extant. Only' about 150 are known and these are spread out in various collections/, especially among the apocrypha of Saint Augustine. This attribution to the Bishop of Hippo is to be explained in part by the fact that Cæsarius always endeavoured to reproduce the great bishop's tone of familiar conversation and often copied him without acknowledgement. His style is pure but very simple; he never hesitated to use homely expressions, in order, as he says, that " all the flock of the Lord may

[*] The Hird (538) and ivth (541) councils of Orleans. That of Auvergne, 533 had already adopted his discipline in part.

2 He was not present in person at the IInd Council of Orleans, 533, norat that of Auvergne, 533, nor the other two councils of Orleans.

3 See below, p. 203-207.

4 Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist, cone.,* 11, p. 102 sq. Text of these canons and a study, *ibid.,* p. (S-1020. Sec also L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrét.,* 1902, p. 363-376.

5 H. Moureau, *Carthage,* in *Doct. thiol,,* col. 1807. Dom Morin however does not think there are sufficient grounds for the attribution of the *Statuta* to Cæsarius, *Rev. bin.,* 1913 (t. XXX). p. 334*342. — 6 See below, p. 207 sq.

7 In *L., Cq,* 104I-1090 (24 homilies) and among St. Augustine's apocrypha. A *l-i* 39» (about 70 sermons : listed in *M. /..,* 67, 1041, rectified in *Diet, (heal.,* 2176). See also the sermons edited by Dom Morin *(op. cit.,)* and Engelbrecht *(Corpus* of Vienna, 1891, among the works of Faustus).

receive heavenly food in a simple and unaffected tongue; and since the ignorant cannot rise to the heights of the learned, the learned must come down to the level of their brothers". The sermons on the mysteries, and the homilies on the Scriptures are somewhat more elevated in tone, but his preaching as a whole retains a very marked practical character[1]. Certain pages dealing with delicate subjects would shock a modern congregation by their outspokenness; but Cæsarius meant everyone to understand him and public morality was much improved by his frankness, the more so as his moral teachins· as a whole verged on the austere[2].

An especially interesting point of his moral doctrine is the classification of sins[3]. He carefully distinguishes the *peccata capitalia* which lead to eternal death [4]*from the *peccata minuta* which do not cause the loss of the soul unless they are greatly multiplied [5]. The mortal or capital sins are as follows : " Sacrilegium ; homicidium, adulterium, falsum testimonium, furtum, rapina; superbia, invidia, avaritia; et, si longo tempore teneatur, iracundia ; et ebrietas, si assidua sit[0] ". These sins can only be remitted by secret or public penance[7] *(lacrimes, rugitus, gemitus)* [8] after confession to the priests who accord pardon[9].* To the capital or mortal sins are opposed the *petty* and small faults committed by all Christians, even the just : neither Saint John the Evangelist, nor the holy man Job, nor any saint have escaped them [x0]. Some of these sins are light in themselves; others are but attenuated forms of grave sins:[11] Cæsarius admitted in fact that these sins, or at least hate, anger and envy, are susceptible of degrees. These *peccata minuta* can be effaced by *good works,* at the head of which he sets the works of mercy (almsgiving), fasting, and patience in the trials of life ". He gives *no definite classification of the virtues.* In one passage he does describe charity, justice, mercy and chastity as a spiritual chariot to bear men to heaven*3; but elsewhere he has other enumerations. They arc subordinated to the special purpose of each sermon and vary according to his authors. More often than not he opposes the vices to the virtues in lists that are more or less complete [*4].

1 See M. Chaillan, *op. cit.,* p. 175-208.
2 See P. Lejay, *Did. thiol.,* col. 2181.
3 *Ibid.,* col. 2180-2183. —4 *Senn.* 104 (Pseudo-Aug.), n. 8.
- *Ibid.,* 1. Elsewhere however, he says that the habit of venial sin rather than their accumulation leads to grave sins. Cf. P. Lejay, *op. cit.,* 21So.
Senn. 104 (Pseudo-Aug.), n. 2; *senn.* 294, 65295, 4. To be completed by SS, 3. In the sixth century, if not according to St. Cæsarius, at least in St. Fulgentius' works, the three *lethalia* sins of the early Fathers have become the types of the sins against God *(sacrilegia),* our neighbour *(facinora)* and oneself *(flagitia).* See J. Tixeroxt, *Hist. Dogm.,* ill, p. 413 (note).
" *Senn.* 249, 6; 261, 1. — [8] *Senn.* 104, 7. — ' *Senn.* 250, 2.
' *Senn.* 52, 1: 15, 4; 104, 3. — [11] Lists in *Senn.* 104, 3; 257, 2.
[11] *Senn.* 142, 2; 15, 4. — [11] *Senn.* 288, I.
u Senn. 17, 3; 34, 3; 244, 3. In one homily he gives a list of the eight vices of the ascetic tradition. I'. Lejay, *op. cit.,* 21S3.

Although greatly preoccupied with moral questions Saint Cæsarius did not neglect dogma in his preaching; but here again it was probably his desire to inculcate some practical lesson which led him to condense Christian doctrine in simple and clear expressions, in the likeness of a creed. Several are to be found in his works, notably at the beginning of the *Statuta Ecclesia antiqua* and in sermon 244. After a study of these facts and a meticulous comparison of the texts, Dom Morin has thought it possible to ascribe to Saint Cæsarius. even the composition of the *so-called* Athanasian Creed [*]. It is especially interesting to note that the Bishop of Arles unreservedly adopted Saint Augustine's ideas regarding original sin and grace.

As Lejay[2] observes " Even the problem of salvation and damnation are solved in the same way as in St. Augustine. If the malice of sinners leads to their eternal loss it is because God has refused them grace. And if one wonders why God should give to some what he denies to others Cæsarius replies like Augustine, "Judicia Dei plerumque sunt occulta, nunquam tamen injusta"[3]. And like Augustine he quotes the well known texts : O altitudo ! O homo tu quis es ut respondeas Dco! Cæsarius was thus an Augustinian of the strict observance. Nevertheless the obligation of preaching and the need of sparing his rustic hearers caused him to admit[4],* side by side with the Augustinian teaching, an explanation verging on the more usual viewpoint : Pharaoh hardened his heart because grace was taken from him; but also because of his wickedness ".

Saint Cæsarius' writings, in addition to the *Rules* and the *Sermons* already mentioned are as follows :

d) Three letters[5], which bear witness to his sollicitude for the religious women in his diocese, and his will[6] in favour of the nuns of the convent of Saint John ;

two opuscula: one *on the Trinity*'[7], the other, recently published [8], on Grace. The latter shows his faithfulness to Augustinism even more than his sermons. The same characteristics mark his activities in the doctrinal field at the second Council of Orange.

II. DOCTRINAL ACTIVITIES AT THE IInd COUNCIL OF ORANGE (529)'.

Cæsarius although more interested in moral questions than in theological speculation nevertheless holds an important place in the history of dogma; his intervention in the great

'See vol. I, p. 349. Cf. P. Lejay, *op. cit.,* 2174-2177. Dom Morin first made the attribution to Cæsarius in the *Rev. bin.* in 1901, but later transferred the honour to St. Martin of Braga in *The Journal of Theol. Studies* in 1910.

2 P. Lejay, *of. cit.,* 2178. — 3 *Semi.* 275. 1. — 4 *Semi.* 22.

5 *P. L.,* 67, 1125-1138.

6 *Ibid.,* 1139-1142. Cf. Dom Morin, *Rev. bin.,* 1899, p. 97-112.

7 Mai, *Nova tat. bibl.,* I, 410; Cf. also D. Morin and Reifferscheid.

8 By Dom Morin, *Rev. bined.,* 1896, p. 433-444.

9 E. Portai.IÉ, *Augustinisme,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 2526 sq. J. 'Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 304-312.

Semipelagian controversy was decisive. "The struggle between the Augustinians and the Semipelagians might have been prolonged indefinitely in Gaul had not a man been found to propose an acceptable solution to both parties; a solution which in reality confirmed the Augustinians, yet avoided a strict upholding of their harsher assertions and gave to human liberty a reasonable role in the work of salvation. This man was Caesarius, Bishop of Arles[1]".

In 527 or 528, a council of the province of Vienne was held at Valence. It was the plan of the adversaries of Augustine's teaching to force their ideas on this gathering. Saint Cæsarius succeeded in forestalling them by sending Bishop Cyprian of Toulon with a theological memorandum in which the Augustinian doctrine was set out and based on the Scriptures, the Fathers and the Popes. In order to circumvent further attacks Cæsarius referred the matter to Rome and asked the pope to approve 19 doctrinal assertions taken from Augustine's writings. These are the *Capitula Sancti Augustini in Urbe Hornee transmissa*[2]. Before returning this document Felix iv made a number of corrections and retained but eight of the original *capitula;*[3] the others were replaced by 16 propositions extracted from Saint Prosper's *Sententiæ*[4]. Cæsarius in his turn judged that he also might retouch and complete them by adding another proposition drawn from some other source.

Pie came therefore to a Council of Orange[5] consisting of 14 bishops in *July 529.* He laid before the council a *document in 2j articles* containing: first, 8 canons extracted by Cæsarius himself from Augustine (1-8) together with another proposition (10) added by himself; then followed the 16 propositions (9 and 11-25) drawn by St. Prosper from Saint Augustine's works and sent by Rome; lastly, a *conclusion* in the form of a rule of faith, drawn up by Saint Cæsarius. This document was approved by the council without demur on July 3rd 529 and again submitted to the Holy See. The new pope, Boniface II (530-532) made no difficulty about confirming this work, for which Rome was in great part responsible (25th January 531): He approved by letter[6] the decisions of the synod and declared that its profession of faith was "consentanea catholicis Patrum regulis" ; he prayed that the zeal and learning of Cæsarius would bring back to the truth those

[1] J. Tixeront, *Ibid.,* p. 304-305.
[2] Mansi, *Concit.,* νιπ, 722-728. — [3] Numbers 3-10.
[4] Drawn by St. Prosper from Augustine. See above, p. 186.
[5] This was the 11nd Council of Orange. The first, much less important, had been held in 441 with St. Hilary of Arles presiding.
[6] *Epist.* I, *P. L.,* 65, 31. See above p. 151.

who had been the dupes of error. His desire was realised. The defined teaching was in general welcomed, and little by little an agreement was reached on questions which had rent the Church of Gaul for more than a century.

Among the definitions of Orange[1] may be distinguished the canons properly so-called (η. I-8), the sententiæ (9-25) and the profession of faith which crowns the work.

The canons. The two first canons deal with the *effects of the sin ofAdam:* 1) weakening of the human will; 2) transmission to all men not only of the death of the body, but also of (original) sin " quod est mors animae ". The other six canons also taken directly from Augustine's writings by Cæsarius (can. 3-8) explain the *part played by grace before justification :* from it alone proceeds prayer (c. 3), good desire (4), the " initium fidei " and the " ipse credulitatis affectus " (5) and all effort towards faith : believing, willing, striving, working, watching, asking, seeking, knocking (6); every salutary act, all seeking of salvation : it is false that some may be saved " per liberum arbitrium " (8)

Propositions 9-25, which are *sententice* rather than canons, complete without any apparent order, various points of the above teaching. They affirm notably *the powerlessness offreewilljor good when left to its own resources,* and hence lhe universal necessity of grace and its gratuitousness. The famous canon 22 says expressly : */Ionio non habet de suo nisi mendacium et peccatum·l* \ by sin should be understood the absence of supernatural righteousness[3]; even the good works that man naturally accomplishes, possess but a mendacious goodness, at bottom equal to sin. since it is incapable of leading men to his true supernatural end[4]. It follows that God alone is *our true strength :* "Fortitudinem gentium mundana cupiditas, fortitudinem autem Christianorum Dei caritas facit ' 17. Without us or with us[5], God produces all the good that we accomplish : " Multa facit Deus in homine bona quæ non facit homo; nulla vero facit homo bona quæ non Deus præstat ut faciat homo 20. Good thoughts and good acts are gifts of God : " Divini est muneris cum et recte cogitamus et pedes nostros a falsitate et injustitia continemus : quoties enim bona agimus, Deus in nobis atque nobiscum ut operemur operatur " (9).

[1] Text in Denzinger-B., *Enchirid.,* n. 174-200.

[2] From S. Augustine, *Tract. V., in Joan.,* n. 1.

[3] It is this goodness that St. Augustine always keeps in sight. Cf. Faure, *Enchirid.,* p. I-II. Even during the controversy with Julian, speaking of the pagans who "naturaliter quæ legis sunt utcumque fecerunt", he adds "Hoc Lamen peccantes quod homines sine fide non ad eum finem isla opera retulerunt ad quem referre debuerunt. " *Con. /ut.,* iv, 25. See vol. i, p. 682, 699. Baius who said almost the same thing was condemned because he understood it in the sense that man cannot produce good acts, of even simple natural goodness.

[4] All the more so, since without an interior and fundamental change, man remains under lhe influence of cupidity or selfishness which spoils in part his best acts. See vol. I, p. 701-703.

[5] Without us by *gratia operans;* with us through *gratia coopci ans.* See vol. I, p. 684.

Among the points contained in the profession of faith which followed the 25 articles and rendered their meaning precise, we would stress two affirmations that well denote the modified character of the codified Augustinism of Orange. First the assertion that the baptised arc *fully able to save themselves* if they so will : " Credimus quod omnes baptizad, Christo auxiliante et cooperante, quæ ad salutem animæ pertinent possint et debeant, si fideliter laborare voluerint, adimplere". This is of capital importance, says Portalié : [1] "It supposes that freewill and sufficient grace are given to all, even for final perseverance. It is true that there is no question here of the unbaptised, but the principle is staled, and thus already in 529, Jansenism was condemned in advance by the council that glorified to the utmost the Augustinian teaching ". After these precisions the Fathers rejected *predestination to evil:* "Aliquos vero ad malum divina potestate prædestinatos esse non solum non credimus, sed etiam si sunt qui tantum malum credere velint, cum omni detestatione illis anathema dicimus".

Augustinism was triumphant at Orange : the existence of original sin, the moral weakening of fallen man, the necessity of grace for all supernatural good were strongly affirmed,and these points constitute the *essence* of Augustinian teaching in this matter. By the very fact, Semipelagianism was definitely rejected in Catholic instruction. Nevertheless fairly numerous *elements* of the Augustinian system were *left in the shade* [2]. Thus with regard to original sin, no reference was made either to the evil of concupiscence, or its role in the transmission of the first fault, or the *massa damnata,* or the damnation of unbaptised children. Similarly nothing was said of the infallible efficacy of grace, or double delectation, or the number of the elect and God's will to save all men. Predestination to evil was rejected but nothing positive was affirmed. But these omissions were after all only *secondary* and may be deduced from the points stated above, which contain all the essentials.

It would be a mistake to think however that the matters neglected at Orange have been eliminated in Catholic theology. Two points alone are probably rejected by all at the present lime; the part played by concupiscence as such in the transmission of original sin, and the damnation of children on account of this sin. Some points indeed were adopted by a later council : Saint Augustine was echoed at Trent when it was declared that concupiscence may be called " sin ", if reference is made only to its historical cause or its effects[3]. The *massa damnata* represents the Catholic doctrine of the universality

[1] E. Portalié, *Augustinisme,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 2527.

[2] See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dot>m.,* in, p. 310-312.

[3] " Peccatum vocatur, non utique quia peccatum est, sed quia ex peccato facta est", says St. Augustine, *Cont. 2 Ep. Pelag.,* bk. 1, ch. xm, 27. It is therefore exaggerated to say that he teaches the intrinsic evil of concupiscence.

oí original sin. The *efficacy of grace* is also conceived in the same sense as in St. Augustine by several schools of theology, which reject the theory of double *delectation,* though only in the Jansenist sense. As regards *God's will to save all,* there has been merely a change of viewpoint : recent theologians insist less on God's will as manifested in its ultimate effects, as Saint Augustine preferred to do, than on the will of God considered in its effects as a whole. Since nothing at all positive is known about the *number of the saved,* opinion has freely covered a wide field. Although the doctrine of *predestination* has never been explicitly defined, it is everywhere admitted by Catholic theologians in the very meaning defended by St. Augustine, *i. e.,* the absolute gratuity of predestination to grace and of total predestination (to grace and glory).

These observations should suffice to show how subjective and groundless is Loofs' strange assertion : " The history of Roman Catholicism is the history of the gradual elimination of Augustinism " [1]. What has really been eliminated is Pelagianism and Semipelagianism. Moreover, there was another doctrine which wholly perverted the Augustinian teaching on grace and predestination; that of salvation by faith without works ; and this was speedily rejected by Saint Augustine himself. It appeared again only in the sixteenth century, sponsored by the self-styled disciples of Augustine.

III. SAINT CÆSARIUS AND MONACHISM.

At the same time that Saint Benedict in Italy was composing the rule that was eventually to be followed throughout the West, Saint Cæsarius was the great monastic lawgiver in Gaul. There are still extant two rules which Cæsarius first composed for two monasteries of his own diocese[2]. The rule for men [3], written before he became bishop is entirely reproduced and augmented in the second, a rule for women in the religious life [4]. The latter appears to have been the saint's favourite work, and was revised and retouched many times during his long years as bishop. Nor did it die with him, but remained for more than two centuries as an inspiration to the monasteries of religious women in Gaul.

[1] Looi s, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte,* 3rd. cd., p. 196.

[2] The monastery for men of which he was Abbot about 500, and the Monastery of Saint John for women in Arles, founded after he became bishop. See M. Ch a il i.a N, f/. *fit.,* p. 209 sq.

[3] *Regida ad monachos. P. L., dj,* 1099-1104.

[4] *Regida ad virgines, P. L., d],* 1107-1116.

The Rule of Saint Cæsarius is hardly more than an adaptation of the Rule of Saint Augustine (letter 211 to the religious of Hippo)* together with certain customs proper to Gaul or borrowed from Lerins where Cæsarius had been a monk. Like Saint Augustine, and sometimes in his very words, Cæsarius exacts the *renunciation of all property* (by gift to the poor or the monastery), community of possessions, modesty of deportment, willing acceptance of any work, fraternal correction, unhesitating obedience, harmony between the sisters, care in avoiding the sins of the tongue, respect and submission to the superior. He forbade the use of *separate cells;* all the religious were to live always and everywhere in community. This ordinance, remarks M. Pourrat, is to be found in the majority of monastic rules of this period, as well as the vow of stability. Cæsarius was also very strict regarding the *cloister* of convents : even the religious' own family can only see her in the *salutatorium.* The women had to fast as austerely as the men and had to recite the *night office* in the same way. "One of the characteristics of the night office or vigil in the South of Gaul, was the *misses* or readings followed by prayers, which took place after the singing of the nocturns. On Sundays there were six of these *missæ;* on other days there were two or three. The number of psalms recited at the little hours of the day were also more numerous than those prescribed by the Benedictine rule; twelve in place of three"[2]. But little is known of the composition of the office, the *ofus Def* which was famous at Arles[3].

With the rule of Saint Cæsarius may be compared one composed at the end of the same century at Luxeuil by Saint Columba[4] and which was followed by a number of men's monasteries in Gaul in the seventh century, before these were attached to the rule of St. Benedict. Like the rule of Cæsarius, this prescribed very long offices. Yet this was not its chief characteristic, nor was the excellent treatise on monastic virtues with which it opens. Although rather vague as to the details of the daily life, which was left more or less to the Abbot's discretion, the Rule of St. Columba was on the contrary very explicit with regard to penalties, and the corporal punishments then in use in all the monasteries[5]. These were more stringent than anywhere else.

* See vol. I, p. 621-622.

9 P. Pourrat, *La spirit, chrtl.,* 1, p. 105.

3 Saint Cæsarius' *monastic* work was continued at Arles bv his successor, Aurelianus (d. 553) who revised the two rules in view of the government of two monasteries founded by the king of the Eranks, Childeberl, in Arles itself in 544. A little later, about 55S, Saint Ferreolus of Uzès (d. 591) also composed a *Rulefor monks,* which was no doubt inspired by that of the Bishop of Arles. Among the customs of the monastery of Uzès may be mentioned the obligation laid on the Abbot to serve in the kitchen three times a year (Christmas, Easter, the feast of the patron saint) and often to wash the feet of the brethren and travellers in imitation of Jesus Christ.

* *P. L.,* 80, 209-224 *(Regula canobialis S Columbani).* St. Columba an Irish monk from Bangor, came to Burgundy in 5S9 or 590 and founded one after the other the monasteries of *Annegray, Fontaine* and especially *Luxeuil,* for which he wrote his rule. When driven out later by Brunehaut, he founded another monastery in Italy at Bobbio, where he died in 615.

5 Some infringements of the rule were punished by strokes of the rod.

This religious life was truly worthy of the great monk of Bangor, but ais weaker brethren could not support it for long. This lack of proportion paved the way for the rule of Saint Benedict

CHAPTER XVII.

Christian Poets.

Special Bibliography : see the notes for each author.

I. SAINT AVITUS[1] (d. 519).

Saint Avitus was born of a senatorial family[3], probably related to the emperor of the same name (455-456). He occupied the see of Vienne from 490 to 519 and was one of the most outstanding figures in all Gaul. As a *statesman* he was able to influence most favourably the Burgundian kings. It is false that he called in Clovis against them, though he did congratulate him on his conversion by saying "Vestra fides nostra victoria est"[4]. King Gundobaid's tolerance for the Catholics was due to his efforts and he also converted his son, Saint Sigismund. He influenced other dioceses besides his own, as is seen by his contribution to the disciplinary work of the Council of Epaôn (517)[5]. He combated, in addition to the Arianism of the Burgundians[6], the Semipelagianism so dear to the Gauls, and even Nestorianism and Monophysitism[7]. He formed a collection of his *homilies*, but these are lost save two

[1] See below, p. 232.

[2] Editions: /< Z., 59 (Sirmond's ed., 1643). *Mon. Germ. hist.* (Peiper's ed.). i. vi, 1883. U. Chevalier, *Œuvres complètes de S. Avit,* Lyons, 1S90. Studies: A. Charaux, Λ'. *Avit, év. de Vienne,* Paris, 1876. H. Goelzer, *Le latin de S. Avit,* Paris, 1909. F. Vernet, *Avit (Saint),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 2639-2644.

[3] Natives of Auvergne. I lesychius, his father, was Bishop of Vienne (d. 490).

[4] He meant, of course a wholly spiritual victory. See U. Chevalier, *Epist. $',op. cit.,* p. 190-193.

[5] Heiele-Leclercq, *Hist, cone.,* 11 (2), p. 1031 sq.

[6] The supposed conversation at Lyons (/< Z., 59, 387-392) was invented by the Oratorian, Vignier. Cf. J. Havet, *Bibl. Ecole des Chartes,* 1885, (t. 46), p. 233-250·

[7] Ep. II and III; *P. L.,* 59, 202-219.

and various fragments [1]. The majority of his prose work now extant is composed of a collection of about po *letters*[2] written between 505 and 518. They form a very valuable aid to an understanding of the religious history of his time.

Saint Avitus remains famous for his devotion to the See of Rome.· he was a "grave and eloquent defender of the Roman Church" says Bossuet[3]. "The idea of the Roman primacy, is, so to speak, *his star,* and it was in union with the Holy See that he desired to safeguard and protect the interests both of Christian civilisation and religious authority"[4]. In his letter 31 [5], he writes : " If you doubt the pope, the whole episcopate, and not merely a single bishop, will totter : *Si 'papa Urbis vocatur in dubium, episcopatus jam videbitur, non episcopus, vacillare".* The uneasiness manifest here, was a result of his learning that Pope S\mmachus was to be judged by a Roman Synod[6]. Hence the horror with which the Acacian Schism inspired him and his desire to see it end ".

Saint Avitus was also a poet, and remained a theologian and a man of doctrine even in his verse. He has been called "The most distinguished of all the Christian poets from the sixth to the eighth century. His *chief work* was a long poem in 2552 hexameters *(Libelli de spiritualis historia gestis)* [7]. These verses tell *of* 1) the creation ; 2) original sin 3) the judgment of God ; 4) the flood ; 5) the crossing of the Red Sea. The first three books which are closely related, constitute a veritable *Paridise Lost* and may have provided Milton with inspiration ; in any case, Guizot judged that several passages would have been worthy of Milton himself. The remaining two books are more loosely related, though both present a figure of baptism. Another of Avitus' extant poems is entitled *On Virginity*** and contains 666 hexameters. It was composed for his sister Fuscina, who was a nun. While Avitus' prose works teem with solecisms, the style of his poetic works is relatively pure, and elegant to the point of affectation.

II. SAINT SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS [10] (431-489).

Unlike Saint Avitus, Sidonius Apollinaris was not a writer of Christian poetry. His verse dates from the early part of his life and "reveals him as a great lord and poet using

[1] Homilies: *ibid.,* 2S9-294: 391-398; fragments, 293-322. Cf. Chevalier.
[2] *Ibid.,* 198-290 and 381-386.
[3] Sermon on the *Unity ofthe Church.*
[4] O. Bardenhewer, *Pat.,* tn, p. 136. — [5] *P. L.,* 59, 249.
[6] See above p. 146. — [7] *Epist.* 7, 87 ; *P. L.,* 59. — [8] *P. L.,* 59, 323-368.
[9] *Ibid.,* 369-382 f*De consolatoria laude castitatis).*

Editions: *L.,* 58 (Sirmond's ed., 1614). *Mon. germ. hist.* (Luet-Johann- ed.), t. vili (1SS7). Other eds. : E. Baret, Paris, 1879; P. Mohr (Coll. Teubner), Paris, 1895. Studies : P. Allard, $. *Sidoine Apollinaire* (Coll. *Les Saints},* Paris, 1910 (bibliography, p. IX-XII). Tillemont, *Mémoires...* XVI (1712), p- 195 284. L. A. Chaix, 5. *Sidoine Ap. et son siècle,* 2 vols, Paris, 1S67. Max Muller, *De Ap. Sidonii latinitate,* Halle, 1888 (104 pp.).

'iterature as a means to rise to high political posts and openly manifesting his ambition " L

He was born at Lyons in 431 or 432 of noble family and, as a youth, studied rhetoric, philosophy, history and law. About the year 452 he married the daughter of the future emperor *Avitus* (455-456;. When the latter took possession of the empire at Rome, Sidonius pronounced a panegyric in verse and thereby earned for himself a statue in the forum of Trajan (456). After Avitus' deposition he defended at Lyons the cause of Gallic independence against *Majorianus;* but when the latter triumphed, Sidonius nevertheless consented to pronounce an eulogy of the victor. He thus entered into favour. Emperor followed emperor in Rome and ten years later *Anthemius* ruled there. Sidonius who happened by chance to be in Rome at that time, again succeeded by his pleasant verses in making a friend ; he was named prefect of the town. In the following year he returned to Gaul and withdrew to his estates in Auvergne (468)=.

Three years later in 471, Sidonius, though unwilling, was called by popular vote to the See of Clermont-Ferrand (Arvernum). Till then his life had been that of a great Christian lord ; henceforth it was to be that of a bishop wholly' wrapped up in his pastoral office, " humble pious, charitable, a lover of literature, sober in his own writing, a champion of the Church and the city against the Barbarians; and in his last days visited by those bitter trials which seem to be the almost necessary' accompaniment and supreme preparation of holiness 3". One of Sidonius' preoccupations was the preventing of the Arian Visigoths' occupation of Gaul. When this conquest finally took place (475) he used all his influence in favour of his Catholic flock and applied himself above all to the spiritual welfare of his people. He died on August 21, 489 4.

" \\ e may wonder with a kind of uneasiness, how this man of the world, hardly quit of his great offices, still proudly' bearing the title of patrician, was able, without preparation, to put on the spirit of his new state. T his impression is lost when we study more closely' the life of Sidonius, hirst of all we see that even in his most wordly days, though he had his weaknesses in things political, he never vacillated in moral or religious matters; he practised the familial virtues and was always sincerely pious. Then we must

' P. Al l a r d , *op. cit.,* p. v-vi.
3 *Ibid.,* p. 1-96 (ch. I-in).
3 *Ibid.,* p. vi.
4 See *ibid.,* ch. V (La défense de 1'Auvergne) and ch. iv (Les dernières années), p. 124-197.

notice that between the time he withdrew to private life and the moment when in spite of himself he was made a bishop, three years had been spent in quiet retreat, in the study of religious works and fréquentation of churchmen. Thus it would seem that Providence, almost without his realising it, had little by little detached him from the world and led him to the threshold of a new life... Like many of his friends, he had renounced the world before he left it, and embraced in advance all that is most serious in the Christian life » ".

During his retreat from 468 to 471 Sidonius published his collected poems[1]. There are 24 of them. The series begin with the three panegyrics to the emperors. Among the more interesting· of those that follow are the " Eucharisticum ", (thanksgiving), addressed to Faustus of Riez and two others on a friend's chateau and the town of Narbonne. Others are occasional pieces *(nugce)* including several nuptial songs; many of them are insignificant, possessing only a certain pleasantness of style. Tillemont found Sidonius' poems " altogether pagan and sometimes quite idolatrous and impious"[3]. But, as Allard remarks, " Tillemont's Jansenism has here rendered him unjust to Sidonius and momentarily obscured the clear judgement of a great critic. The paganism of Sidonius' poems is altogether superficial ; he adopted the literary fashions of his epoch, but had not the slightest regret for the ancient deities : I have searched all his works in vain for any word deserving the accusation " idolatrous " or " impious " or in any way outraging the most exacting' modesty "[4].

Sidonius Apollinaris' correspondence, together with St. Augustine's, is one of the chief sources for the historv of the fifth century. " How important were letters at a time when no newspapers existed ! They formed the only bond between people who otherwise would have known nothing of one another and very little of their own country and their own times"[5]. It is not difficult to understand therefore why Bishop Sidonius thought it his duty to make a great collection of his letters. Moreover, k'he seems to have considered that they would enable him in a way most fitting to his new state of life, to uphold the old Roman traditions in the face of the invader and to prevent as much as possible the barbarians, wholly imbued with Arianism, from imposing their inferior culture on a civilisation which was then altogether orthodox"[6]. After 477 he published his letters in nine books following closely one after the other[7]. Many critics have been extremely severe and even unjust towards this correspondence, of which Allard unreservedly approves both the matter and the form [8].

[1] *Ibid.,* p. vi-vil. See ch. iv, La retraite, p. 97-123.

[2] *P. L.* 58› δ39·748 *(Carmina).* Fr. trans., see note 7. See A. PoiZAT, *Les poètes chrétiens,* Paris, 1902, p. 69 sq. (historical notes).

[3] *Mémoires* xvi, p. 208. — [4] *Op. cit.,* p. 122-123.

[5] P. Allard, *Ibid.,* p. 1S8. —[6] *Ibid.,* p. 145.

[7] *P. L.,* 58, 443-637. Fr. trans, of all the works, by Grégoire and Collombet, 3 vols (Lat. and Fr. text) Paris, 1836. — [8] *Op. cit.,* p. 194-195.

Sidonius' Latin is not that of the classical centuries. "But, if we are content to accept a less exalted standard, Sidonius' style still represents the good Latin tradition. Although his *prose* was inferior not only to Pliny's whom he regarded as his model, but also to that of Symmachus and the fourth-century Gallo-Roman panegyrists; although his *verse* was not so good as that of Claudianus or even Ausonius and Paulinus of Nola, Sidonius nevertheless still wrote very pure Latin if his prose is compared with that of Gregory of Tours and his poetry with that Fortunatus. He seems to call a halt on the road to decadence" [1]

III. VARIOUS POETS IN GAUL AND ITALY.

Between Sidonius Apollinaris and Fortunatus there were several second-class poets in Gaul and Italy who deserve mention.

1. **Paulinus of Pella** (376-460?) probably grandson of Ausonius, wrote a charming autobiography *(Eucharisticos Deo...)*[2] in verse that is frequently faulty but inspired with great and noble feeling.

2. **Paulinus of Périgueux** composed about 470 a long *poem on St. Marlin of Tours*[3], comprising 3622 hexameters in six books. His verse was faultless but long and verbose.

3. The poetess **Elpis**, a Sicilian and perhaps the wife of Boethius, who was as remarkable for her piety as for lier wit, used to be considered the author of the hymns of the Office of SS. Peter and Paul[4], but this attribution is extremely doubtful.

4. **Rusticus Elpidius** (d, about 530) a deacon and Theodoric's doctor (?) left an elegant and affected poem "On the favours of Jesus Christ " (149 hexameters), and 24 inscriptions on various Biblical scenes [5].

5. **Arator**, (first part of 6th cent.) a deacon of the Roman Church rendered the *Aets of the Apostles* in verse (2126 hex. in 2 books)[6]: there are fine passages in his work, but he has been reproached with sacrifying historic accuracy to allegory. In 544 he had the honour of reading his work in public at St. Peter ad Vincula. Arator look Sedulius as his model but he is far from being his equal.

[1] P. Allard, *ibid.*, p. 196-197.

[2] *Co/pus* of Vienna (G. Brandes' ed.), t. XVI (1SS8), p. 263-334. Cf. J. ROCAEORT, *De Paulini Pellai vita et carmine,* Bordeaux, 1890. Devogel, *Elude sur la latinité et le style de P. de P.,* Brussels, 1898. P. de Labriolle, *Hist. lilt. lai. chrét.,* p. 626-629.

[3] *P. L.*, 61, 1009-1076. *Corpus q i* Vienna, (M. Petschnig's ed.), t. XVI (1888). To the poem on St. Martin is to be added another on the cure of a great-nephew and another to be used as an inscription for the Basilica of Tours at the request of St. Perpetuus. Others were forged by Vignier. Cf. Havet, *Bibl. Ecole des Charles,* 1885, 205 sq.

[4] *Decora lux uteroitatis auream* and *Beate Pasto/. Petre, clemens accipe, P. L.,* 63, 537-53S. —[5] *P. L.*, 62, 543-548. Re-edited by W. Brandes, Brunswick, 1890.

[6] *P. L.*, 68, 63-246 (245-252 : poem dedicated to Parthenius).

There is no need to refer again to *Ennodius of Pavia's* poetic work, already mentioned

The poetry of *Claudian Mamertus* can scarcely be looked upon as authentic

IV. SAINT FORTUNATUS. (530-600) λ

Fortunatus (530-600) was born in Northern Italy near Treviso. After having thoroughly studied grammar, rhetoric and law at Ravenna, he left his country about 565 with the intention of making a pilgrimage to Tours, to the tomb of St. Martin who had cured him of opthalmia. He arrived there only after many delays, notably one of some duration at the court of Austrasia. He lived from day to day in the manner of the Troubadours of the Middle Ages, rewarding his powerful hosts the princes and bishops with his verses and flattery. Even Tours could not stay him. He took his vagabond way into the south of Gaul, then returned to Poitiers where he was at last persuaded to remain by Saint Radegunde (d. 587) the widow of Clotaire I, who was living in retirement in the convent of Holy Cross which she had founded according to the rule of Saint Caesarius. He became a close friend of the saint, was made priest and became chaplain to the monastery. About 595 he even became Bishop of the town. He died there " in the odour of sanctity, amidst general grievingon the 14th December 600".

Of Fortunatus' *prose works* there remain : *six lives of saints* \ especially that of St. Radegunde, and brief explanations of the *Paler* and *Credo* inserted in his Carminaf But the majority of his work was poetic. It comprises a Life of St. Martin6 in 2243 hexameters, written before 576 at the request of Saint Gregory of Tours : this life was written in two months and reveals the author's facility but also a corresponding lack of application. Fortunatus' chief collection of poems, *Carmina qx Miscellanea*^ seems to have been prepared by the author

1 See above p. 156. — ' See above p. 179.

3 Editions: *P. L.,* 88, (Dorn. Luchi's ed., 1786). *Mon. germ. hist.,* (editions : Leo, Krusch), t. iv, 1881-1885. Fr. trans. Ch. Nisard, Paris, 1887. Studies: F. Hamelin, *De vita et operibus V. Fortunati,* Rennes, 1873. 1). Leroux. *Le poète F. Fortunat,* Paris, 1887. Ch. Nisard, *Le poète Fortunat,* Paris, 1S90. A. MENEGHETTI, *La Latinità di V. Fortunato*^ Turin, 1917. P. Godet, *Fortunat (saint),* in *Did. thiol.*, col. 611-614.

' *L.,* 88, 439-512 [lives of St. Hilary of Poitiers, St. Germain of Paris (d. 576), St Albinus of Angers (d. 560), St. Paternus of Avranches (d 563) St. Radegunde (d. 587)] and 541-55° [Life of St. Marcel of Paris (436)] Other lives Ixxiring his name are not authentic.

5 The *Pater* in *Carni.* X, I ; the *Credo* in *Cann.* XI, 1.

6 *P. L.*. 88, 363-426. —7 *Ibid.,* 59-362.

himself; but it was completed later by the addition of pieces he had omitted. The work is divided into eleven books', and comprises, in addition to several short occasional pieces, longer or more deeply inspired compositions, as, for instance, the three *hymns* incorporated in the Roman Breviary'. The elegy on the destruction of Thuringia 2 does not lack beauty. We may also mention a fairly considerable number of metrical inscriptions especially epitaphs, bearing his name 45

There is no doubt that Fortunatus belongs to the period of literary decline. His work on the whole is more religious than that of Sidonius Apollinaris, but his inspiration lacks depth, save in occasional pieces. It is even quite hackneyed in some, in certain pieces descriptive of banquets for instance : and he is decidedly vulgar when writing on trivial subjects 5. Rubbing shoulders with the barbarians had the effect of making people less sensible to refinement. Nor does religious inspiration appear more markedly in a great deal of verse in which Fortunatus unreservedly flatters the great. These faults moreover are not compensated by any outstanding literary qualities. His style is not always of the purest nor his metre always correct. Nevertheless, his uncommon facility proves that he was gifted with a very real talent and it is easy to understand why, during an epoch of mediocre culture, he was universally admired. Not any poet could have composed the *Vexilla regis prodeunt* or deserved the attribution of the *Ave ¡naris stella,* the most popular hymn of the entire liturgy.

V. DRACONTIUS6. (Vth century).

Dracontius is the most distinguished and the most interesting of the African Christian poets. *Commodianus* in the third century had cultivated only a popular kind of verse little related to traditional

' Books I-Vin, poetry previous to 576; ix, poetry from 577 to 584 ; X and XI, later work, probably classed by another hand.

2 These are the two hymns of Passion Sunday : *Pange, lingua, gloriosi pitelium arlamiiris* (Carni, π, 7), and the hymn to Mary, *Qitn/i tena, pontus, altura* (Carni, vin, 4) of Matin and Lauds of the B. V. M. The *Ave man's stella* ¡salso attributed to him : Carni, vin, 5 (*P. Z.*, 88, 265). The editor of *Mon. germ. hist.,* 1881, F. Leo, rejects these two latter. We may probably expect more from the critics on this subject.

3 *P. Z.*, 88, 427-437·

* See H. Leclercq, *Fortunat,* in *Diet. Areh.,* col. 19S2-1994.

5 See *ibid.,* col. 1994-1997·

6 Editions: *P. L.,* 60 (ed. Arevalo, S. J.) *Mon. germ, hist.,* (Vollmer's ed.), XVI, Berlin. 1905. Studies: C. Rossberg, *in Draconiii earmina...* Stade, 1878; *De Draeontio,* 18S0. G. BOISSIER, *I.'Afrique lomaine.* Paris, 1901' p 309 sq. I'· Godet, *Dracontius,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1822-1824.

prosody'. Verecundus de **Junca**'. (d. 552) wrote little more than a poem in 212 hexameters on *penitential satisfaction;* the majority of his exegetic work (commentaries on the canticles of the Old restament, in 9 books) and his theological work (extracts from the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon), is written in prose. Dracontius on the other hand is wholly a poet, a true Christian poet.

He belonged to a very wealthy family of North Africa. After a thorough education he had entered on a legal career when he was imprudent enough to compose a poem to the glory of the Emperor of Byzantium. The Vandal king Guntamund (484-496) although usually tolerant towards Catholics[3], looked on this as treasonable; he confiscated his possessions, reduced his wife and children to dire poverty and threw the author himself into prison. It is not known whether he was ever released. In vain he wrote from his cell an elegy *(Satisfaction)* in 158 distiche in the hope of regaining his freedom[4]. Therein he admits his fault, sings the mercy of God who permitted him to expiate his sins, and implores his sovereign's pity.

Soon he resumed the same subject in another and much longer poem in 3 books of more than 3000 hexameters, entitled Laudes Dei or Carmen de Deo[5]. The 1st book extols the goodness of God in the Creation, and the I Ind, in the preservation of the world and the work of Christ; the Hird isa fervid exhortation to confidence in God. The first, the author's chef d'œuvre is of special importance since a part of it, from verse 116 to the end (verse 754), was published and read separately over a long period under the title *Hexaemeron creationis mundi*[6,7] (the first 115 verses were an introduction inspired by his circumstances) : in this work the author treated a subject already used by Victor of Marseilles and Saint Avitus. A number of *non-religious poems*[1] are also attributed to him; but these do not interest us here.

" The entire work of Dracontius, so strongly imbued with rhetoric, bears witness to his knowledge of the poets of Imperial Rome as well as the Sacred Scriptures. Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius, the whole world of mythology, all were familiar to Dracontius. His sincere enthusiasm for versification did not always preserve him, either in his prosody or his grammar, from lapses due to the *lingua rustica,* the tongue of the

[3] See vol. I, p. 269-270.

[4] Pitra sed. *Spie. Solesm.,* iv (1858) Cf. p. 153. See L. Vernier, *Commoditn et Verecundus* in *Pcv. de Philologie,* 1891 (t. XV), p. 117-130.

[1] See above, p. 191. — [5] *P. L.,* 60, 901-932.

[5] *Ibid.,* 679-902.

[6] See also *P. L.,* 87, 371-384. 388.

[7] Edited by F. de Duhn, *Dracontii carmina minora,* Leipsic 1873. Also the *Ttagedy of Orestes,* PeiPER'S ed., Breslau, 1875.

people. But his two chief poems, both animated with deep religious feeling and vibrating with wholly original and personal sentiments, owe their special quality and powerful charm to their combination of lyrical outpourings and didactic narration [1]

CHAPTER XVIII.

Boethius and Cassiodorus.

Special Bibliography : see the notes for each author.

I. BOETHIUS' (470-325).

A) Boethius and the treatise "De Consolatione Philosophiae

Boethius [3] was the last great representative of philosophy in the West, before the end of the Patristic Age. He was born in Rome about 470-480 of the ancient and famous family of the Anicii, which had embraced the faith in the time of Constantine. He was given a Christian education and himself professed Christianity. He perfected his literary, philosophical and scientific studies at Athens. His repute for learning, added to his natural advantages of noble race and personal charm, brought him into favour with Theodoric when he returned to Rome. He was named consul in 510 and 522 and had the joy of seeing his two young sons also appointed consuls. But there came a time, when in the midst of apparent security, disaster fell on his house. Theodoric was an Arian. He looked with suspicion on the reconciliation that had taken place between Byzantium and the

[1] P. Godet, *op. cit.*, col. 1822.

[2] Edition: *P. L.*, 63-64. Studies: N. Gervaise, general study *P. L.*, 64, 1411-1600. G. Baur, *De Boethio Christiana doctrina assertore,* Darmstadt, 1841. L. Biraghi, *Boezio filosofo, theologo, martire...* Milan, 1865. L. C. Bourquard, *De Boetio christiano viro, philosopho, ac theologo,* Paris. 1887. A. Hildebrand, *Boethius und seine Stellung zum Christentum,* Regensburg, 1885. M. Grabmann, *in Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* i, p. 148-177. P- Godet, *Bocce,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 918-922. W. Turner in *Ene. Cath.,* voi. 11, p. 610. Literary studies by G. Bkduaz, Breslau, 1883, Strigali, 1892 (short Latin dissertations).

[3] Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severinus Boethius or Boetius.

popes in the time of the Emperor Justinus1. Whoever favoured this policy at Rome was suspected of treason. Boethius who had courageously undertaken the defence of a senator, also the victim of an accusation of this kind, was himself denounced to the easily angered prince as a partisan of Byzantium. For this, together with the crime of magic that was laid to his charge, he was thrown into prison at Pavia. He never regained his liberty, for the barbarian emperor easily obtained the death sentence from the slavish Senate. He was cruelly executed between 524 and 5262

In the silence of his prison Boethius wrote his great and famous work On the Consolation of Philosophy 3. The work, which is in the form of a dialogue, fills five books. The short pieces of verse which frequently interrupt the text add further to the variety of form and the beauty of the style. *The subject* of the work is exactly shewn in the title: in misfortune Boethius seeks happiness; Philosophy' consoles him by showing him where and how he may find it.

Book I forms an introduction : whilst the author is complaining of his misery, Philosophy appears to him under the appearance of a noble lady; she offers to share his unhappiness, and asks him to confide in her; he obeys and in the course of his story admits to his doubts in Providence. In book II Philosophy shows him the inconstancy of fortune and how incapable are the things of this world to satisfy mankind, whose true happiness is to be found in the things of the spirit.

In book III Philosophy defines beatitude, " *Status bonorum omnium congregatione perfectus*" (prose 2) and shows that all men naturally desire it, but the majority go astray in looking for it in exterior things: riches 3, honours 4, power 5, glory 6, pleasures 7. At this point Boethius addresses a magnificent prayer to his Creator asking for light (9) and the book comes to an end with the demonstration of the existence of true happiness; the imperfect supposes the perfect, imperfect good entails sovereign good (10), which can be no other but God, the Good whom all desire : ll *Felix qui potuit Boni — Fontem visere lucidum* This third book, the real heart of the entire work, and as Gardeil4 says "a literary monument raised to the glory of true blessedness", has been more widely used than any other by the Scholastics and particularly by St. Thomas.

' See above p. 146.

9 Boethius has been venerated as a martyr in Italy and as late as 1S83 the Sac. Cong, of Rites recognised the lawfulness of his *cultus* in the diocese of Pavia. His condemnation had all the appearances of a political trial, but the emperor's Arianism, of which John I was a victim, had perhaps something to do with the sentence. Boethius' case however was not altogether the same as that of John I· — 3 *F* 63, 581-862. Many editions.

* Art. *Beatitude,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 509.

In book IV, coming directly to the specific nature of Boethius' complaints, Philosophy explains the ways of Providence with regard to men : although the wicked may triumph here below, order will be restored in the next life, founded on merit and demerit, which are the great laws oí Providence. Finally book V tells of Divine Omniscience which has foreseen all things and which does not exclude human freedom, in spite of the fact that we can grasp only with difficulty how these two truths are reconciled. The work ends with the magnificent chapter (6) in which Boethius gives his famous definition of *eternity (interminabilis viter tota si/nui et perfecta possessio)* and shows that since God sees all things in an eternal present, His knowledge of future contingents no more hinders their freedom than does the sight of present free acts prevent their author from performing them freely.

This work was composed with great skill and was in consequence immensely popular, especially in the Middle Ages when it gave birth to uncountable translations, commentaries and imitations. The most famous of these imitations is the *Consolation of Theology* ' written by Gerson in his retreat in the Bavarian mountains in 141<8-1419. It has been claimed that Boethius, to judge by his great work, *ivas not a Christian,* or at least only nominaily so It is quite true, remarks Godet 3, that in this treatise "The ideas and the language are both inspired by a Xeo-Platonism tempered by certain Peripatetic notions, together with a tinge of Stoicism, reflecting Boethius' personal character and his reading of the Roman philosophers. Xo mention of Jesus Christ, nor of the Apostles and the Fathers, not a quotation from Moly Writ; the author puts his faith in Philosophy alone". Is that the attitude of a Christian in the face of death? But as *it is rightly pointed ont* Boethius does not portray himself entirely in his book. It is enough that the feelings he expresses contain nothing anti-Christian. And we find that far from revealing the least opposition to Christian truths, *they imply them* : " The Christian and the Christian of deep faith is found and manifested in the purity of his morality, and still more in the confidence and warmth with which he defends it 4 ", Moreover his theological work bears ample witness to his faith.

1 See below, p. 688.

' Oblnr *(edit.,* Iena, 1843), Ch. Jourdain *(Excursions hist. et philos, à travers le M.-A.,* Paris 1888). See G. Boissier, in *Journal des Savants,* 1889, p. 449-462.

3 *Ofi. cil.* col. 920.

4 O Bardenhewer (P. Godet), *Pair.* in, p. 175.

B) Boethius' other works. His influence.

The treatise *De Consolatione Philosophice* is only a part of Boethius' work. He also undertook the task of *translating* and *comnunentating* all Aristotle's writings as well as Plato's dialogues, and of showing the harmony of the two systems in the majority *of* the chief questions they treat. Of his works of this kind, all that survive, in addition to a commentary of Cicero's "Topics"[1] and a translation and commentary of Porphyry's *Isagoge**, are works on Aristotle[3]: simple translations (1st and 2nd *Analytics, Topics,* and *Refutation of the Sophists),* or translations with commentary (the *Categories').* He also wrote a translation and two commentaries of the treatise *On Interpretation* Περί ερμηνεία [4] which is possibly Aristotle's. One of these commentaries was meant for beginners: the other, "the author's best work " for specialists. To this already considerable enumeration must be added a number of *original writings*[5], either on philosophical subjects in the proper meaning of the term (categorical and hypothetical syllogisms — division[6] — specific difference), or on scientific questions [7]: music (5 books) arithmetic (2 books) and probably geometry[8].

Boethius did not treat only of philosophy ; he dealt also with theology in 5 opuscula devoted to dogmatic subjects. The author has a preference for mysteries whose explanation is helped out by philosophy. Thus he gave precision to the relations between nature and person when treating the subject of the Trinity (opuse. I, 11)[9] or the Incarnation in Op. V [10]*which is by far the most important ". He also wrote of that goodness which is essential to substances inasmuch as they possess being, in Op. Ill ", dedicated to the deacon John (afterwards Pope John 1)[13] : this writing is much more philosophical than theological. On the other hand, the *De fide catholica* (op. iv)[14] deals mainly with revealed truth : it consists of a rapid outline of the fundamental dogmas of Christianity; Trinity, Creation, Fall, Incarnation, Redemption. Unfortunately, there remains some doubt of the authenticity of this

1 A.. 64, 1040-1174 (6 books). —3 *Ibid.,* 1-158 (double commentary).
3 *Ibid.,* 159 sq. — 4 *Ibid.,* 293-640. — 5 *Ibid.,* 761 sq.
c The treatise *On definition* which follows is probably by Marius Victorious.
7 *P. L.,* 63, 1079-1300.
8 The authenticity of the other works contained in *L.,* is more than doubtful.
9 Op. i: *De unitate Trinitatis, P. L.,* 64, 1247-1255. Op. ii, *Utrum Pater et Filius ac Spiritus Sanctus de divinitate substantialiter pradicentur. Ibid.,* 1299-1302.
10 *Liber de persona et duabus naturis contra Eutychen et Nestorimn. Ibici.,* 1337-1354 (In 8 chapters).
" The first three chapters contain important definitions. The most famous regarding the person is well known : *Persona est rationalis natura individua substantia* (ch. 111).
13 *Quomodo substantia in eo quod sint, bona sint. P. L.,* 64, 1311-1314.
13 These four opuscula were commentated (1, II, in, v) by Gilbert de la Porree text in *P. L.,* 64, following the opusculum). St. Thomas commentated the 1st in his Op. 63; it is doubtful if he did the same for the 3rd since his opusculum 63 is thought to lie spurious by the critics...
•4 Also entitled *Brevis fidei Christiana complexio, P. L.,* 64, 1333-I 338.

writing: but in any case, the very Christian nature *of* the work is not a sufficient reason for not attributing it to Boethius.

Boethius enjoyed considerable influence. His manner of conceiving *theology* announces the works of the Schoolmen. He accepts dogma, but also applies all the resources of cool reasoning in order to prove and elaborate it. Thus, faith opens itself to the intelligence with the help of philosophy, which in its turn profits by the light of revelation. He also furnished the Schoolmen with several famous definitions, particularly those of beatitude, eternity, Providence and destiny *(fatum)* [1] as well as those of nature and person [2].* But however important was Boethius' influence in theology "the influence of the *philosophical books* was more general and more profound, says P. Godet [3]. Without fear of contradiction it may be said that after Aristotle, Boethius was the greatest authority of the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages. All that the Mideile Ages, before the middle of the twelfth century, knew of Aristotle, it had read in Boethius; he was the skilful interpreter of the Peripatetic logic which was wholly assimilated, both style and method, by Scholasticism [4]; He was the interpreter of Porphyry who set in movement the long and heated quarrels between Nominalism and Realism ". He himself professed with regard to the object of the intelligence, a moderate realism, similar to that of St. Thomas [4]. Boethius whose character and style have earned him the appellation of *last of the Romans,* also deserved the title of *founder of Scholasticism* [5].

II. CASSIODORUS[6] (477-570).

A) Statesman.

It is usual to compare Cassiodorus whith Boethius, in spite of the many traits of character that distinguish them. Both

[1] Beatitudo est status bonorum omnium congregatione perfectus. *Cons.,* in, *pr.* 2. *(Sum. theol.,* la-næ, q. 3, a. 2). .Eternita S est igitur interminabilis vitæ tota simul et perfecta possessio. *Cous.,* v, *pr.* 6. (5. /Λ., 1, q. 10, a. 1). Providentia est ipsa divina ratio in summo omnium principe constituta, quæ cuncta disponit. *Cous,* iv, *pr.* 6(5. *th.* 1, q. 116, a. 1). Fatum est inbærens rebus mobilibus dispositio, per quam Providentia suis quæque nectit ordinibus. *Cons,* iv, *pr.* 6. *(S. th.,* i, q. 116, a. i). — [a] See above p. 220, note 11.

[3] *Op. cit.,* 921. — [4] See especially the commentary on *Isagoge,* bk. I (end.)

[5] See M. Grabmann, *op. cit.*

[6] Editions : *P. L.,* 69-70 (Garets' ed., 1679, completed). — Studies : D. de Sainte-Marthe, *Vie,* Paris, 1694. A. Franz, *Cassiodorus S.* (in German), Breslau, 1872. G. Minasi, *Cassiodoro Senatore,* Naples, 1895. P. Batiffol, *Cass¡odore,* in *Did. bibl.,* col. 337-340. P. Godet, *Cassiodore* in *Diet. Ihéol.,* col. 1830-1834.

at tiie same time were Theodoric's ministers; a position they acquired through their nobility and their rare personal talents. For three generations Cassiodorus' family had occupied *political posts.* Fie himself at the age of twenty l became questor, *{qucestor sacri palatii)* the king's private secretary, and, in practice, minister for home affairs. At various times he added to these functions the office of consul and Pretorian prefect, and like Clovis and Charlemagne at a later date, received the title of patrician. He was the soul of Theodoric's government and the greatness of this reign is in great measure due to him. Theodoric's successors continued to shower favours on him, and to have recourse to his services, until he retired from public life when he had passed the age of sixty (540).

Cassiodorus did not allow his duties as statesman to take up all his time. Even during *this part of his life* there are several documents which bear witness to his literary output.

l A chronicle[2] dating from 519 contains in its first part no more than a list of consuls together with historical accounts drawn from St. Jerome and St. Prosper, but the author's personal souvenirs from 496 to 519 render it truly valuable.

2) An important History of the Goths *De origine actibusque Getarum)* written at Theodoric's request, but only after the latter s death, shows a tendency, already visible in the Chronicle to reconcile the conquered Romans with the victorious barbarians; of the 12 books of this work there is extant but an imperfect summary composed by Jordanis in 559'. With this work may be compared the panegyrics of the Gothic kings and queens, by Cassiodorus. They probably struck the same note, but have survived only in doubtful fragments.

3) There is still extant the collection of letters or rescripts[4] that Cassiodorus drew up in the course of his public duties and brought together between 534 and 538 : there are nearly 400 of them in 12 books. This collection not only possesses a capital historical interest; it is also outstanding from a literary viewpoint and its style was used as a model by all the chancelleries of the Middle Ages.

Cassiodorus' interest was not confined only to affairs of state and the preoccupations of an historian. The nobler questions of morality and philosophy also drew his attention. He showed a lively interest in " *educational*

' He lived io l>e at least 93, for this age is given in the *De orthographia,* but the exact dates of his birth and death are unknown. The latter is usually stated as about 570. He was born, therefore, about 477.

• *P. L.*, 69, 1213-1248.

l Ibid., 1251-1296. See below p. 228.

4 Ibid., 501-880.

questions" says Godet, " and, intent on destroying the wholly Pagan rhetoric that Ennodius admired so wholeheartedly r, he undertook, aided by Pope Saint Agapetus, to found Christian schools at Rome in which the study of sacred writings would occupy a place of honour. The unsettled condition of affairs prevented the execution of this project2". At this period of his life St. Agapetus was pope from 535 to 536; he evinced a dominating interest in the *great truths of* life : the opusculum " *De anima*" written shortly before 540 to defend the spiritual nature of the soul reveals his vast reading on this subject and echoes the ideas of Saint Augustine and Claudianus Mamertus3. "More than once, and particularly towards the end, the author confesses his desire for the contemplative life in the silence of the cloister; a bridge, as it were, joining the two sides of the writer's life, his secular works and his religious writings 4".

B) Monk. Scholar.

At last about 540, Cassiodorus, more than sixty years old, bade farewell to the world and began in the cloister *a new life* that was to last for thirty years and whose benificent influence was to endure right into the Middle Ages. Cassiodorus retired to a monastery he had founded on his family estates in Calabria on the shores of the Gulf of Scyllaceum (Scyllaee) at *Vivarium,* There he permitted those monks who wished to lead the life of solitaries to live in cells on the slopes of mount Castellum which overlooked the monastery. He himself favoured the coenobetic life. He based his rule on Egyptian traditions, urging his monks to cultivate *intellectual work.* Only those incapable of the latter did manual work ; the others transcribed manuscripts, translated early works both secular and religious or composed works of their own. The religious life in no way suffered, for it was just as intense and fervent as in other monasteries. It is chiefly due to Cassiodorus that the idea of intellectual culture " found its way more easily into the monasteries. Study became a fresh element of Latin monastic life. A source of moral strength in the midst of a crumbling social order, monasticism was an intellectual reservoir at

' See above p. 156.
3 P. Godet, *op. al.,* col. 1S30.
3 See above p. 179.
4 O. Bardenhewer, *Pair.,* in, p. 1S2.

a time when letters and the arts were threatened with destruction in the shipwreck of antique civilisation "

Cassiodorus' project, though in itself excellent, *was too far-reaching,* and therein lay its weakness. As Doni Berlière remarks: "Cassiodorus conceived monachism in a more intellectual form than Saint Bernard; he wished, it would seem, to adapt it to the most talented minds; this entailed a limitation of its influence, and compromised its future, since select intellectual groups can never be sure of a continued issue". The brilliant statesman's monastic foundation scarcely survived him. His initiative has been prolonged by the sons of the humble monk of Subiaco and Mount Cassino, who, about 530, embodied in his rule, in addition to prayer, the precept of work in general without specifying " any particular external purpose "[1][2][3]

The religious works of Cassiodorus, on the other hand, lived long after he was dead and made of him one of the first doctors of the Middle Ages,[4]

His famous Institutiones *divinarinn et scrculariuni lectionum'"* (written about 544) inspired the syllabus in the Universities. The *1st book* is an introduction to theology and Holy Scripture, and the 2nd, a summary of the 7 liberal arts (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics[4];* arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy). This second book was for a long period published separately. A few days before his death, Cassiodorus al the age of 93 added to it the little treatise *De Orthographia*,* his last writing. The " Institutiones" like Saint Augustine's " Doctrina Christiana " witnesses " the union of sacred and secular knowledge, that forms a complete and truly Christian education "[6][7]

Cassiodorus also furnished the Middle ages with a manual of History in die form of his " *Distoma Tripartita* "[5] which is no more than a fusion of lhe three works of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret, translated into Latin by one of his friends, Epiphanius. The translation is poor. I he actual compilation of the texts was hastily made by Cassiodorus himself. As it stands, the work is a worthy continuation of Rufinus' History.

\\ hile he was at Vivarium Cassiodorus also wrote a number of exegetic works, all entitled *Complexiones* since it was the author's practice to explain several verses together. Some dealt with lhe

1 Dom U. Berlière, *L'ordre monastique,* Paris, 1921, p. 46.

2 See *ibid.,* p. 42-46.

3 A 7°» 1105-1150 (bk. i); 1149-1220 (bk. n: *De artibus ac disciplinis liberalium litterarum).*

4 'I his group formed lhe *trivium* by contrast with the *quadrivium* or group of the four other courses of study.

5 *P. L.,* 70, 1239-1270.

6 P. Godet, *op. cit.,* col. 1832.

7 *p. L.,* 69, 879-1214 fin 12 books).

New Testament (Acts of the Apostles, Epistles, Apocalypse)* but the most famous, the only ones known to the Middle Ages, when they were much appreciated and imitated, were his voluminous commentaries on the Psalms *(Complexiones in psalmos)* [1]. As a rule Cassiodorus took Augustine as his favourite guide, and like the latter made great use of allegorical exegesis to bring out the mystical sense.

Cassiodorus died a holy death about the year 570. He never became, however, the object of a true *cultus*. He stands out as an erudite rather than a saint. He resembled Boethius in his love of letters but differed from him in many of his qualities. Whilst Boethius was a speculative philosopher, Cassiodorus was before all things practical. He was less interested in ideas than in moral and intellectual training, using for this purpose the ancient writings of the Pagan authors as well as the works of Churchmen. His frequent quotations of both these latter [3] rendered an immense service to mediaeval culture. Although not as methodical as St. Isidore, he shared the latter's universal intellectual curiosity. He cannot be classed with Boethius as a founder of Scholasticism, yet he was nevertheless one of the masters the most in vogue during the Middle Ages.

CHAPTER XIX.

Historians, Canonists and Ascetics.

Special Bibliography : See the notes for each author.

I. HAGIOGRAPHY.

Under this heading will be grouped : I. two collections of biographies : one on early writers by Gennadius; the other, on the popes, by an anonymous writer; 2. special biographies.

A) Gennadius of Marseilles [4].

Gennadius of Marseilles, a priest who died about 494, is best known for his continuation, under the same title, of

1 *P. L.*, 70, 1321-1418.
2 *P. L.*, 70, 9-1056 (Introduction, 9-26).
3 See the list drawn up by H. LECLERCQ, *Cassiodore,* in *Diet. Arch.*, col. 2357-2365.
4 Br. Czapla, *Gennadius ais Litera*historiker,* Munster, 1898.

St. Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus* h The author, who was widely read, is a most precious witness for the literarv history of the fifth century. The parts of his work dealing with writings are generally more reliable than the biographical details. He is fairly impartial, in spite of his apparent Semipelagian leanings. The work at present contains too chapters but the last ones (92-100), are from another hand. The 100th, devoted to the author himself, makes him say : " I have composed Vili books *against the heresies,* VI books *against Nestorius,* and VI books *against Eutyches,* III books *against Pelagius,* treatises on *Millenarianism* and on the Apocalypse of Blessed John, the present work *(De Viris)* and a letter touching my faith that I have sent to Blessed Gelasius Bishop of Rome ". All these writings are lost save the *De Viris,* and an opusculum *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*2 that is usually identified with the letter to Pope Gelasius, but would really appear to come from the books "against the heresies", of which it may form the conclusion 3. Other fragments are attributed to him, not without grounds 4.

B). The Liber pontificalis 5.

The *Liber Pontificalis* is a vast collection of biographical accounts of the popes. After the XVth century it was ascribed to Anastasios the Librarian (ixth cent.) on account of an erroneous note in the Platina edition of 1610. It has been proved to be of earlier date by Mgr Duchesne. The first edition of the work, devoted to the popes from St. Peter until Felix IV (526-530), dates from little later than 530. The unknown author by whom it was composed at the beginning of the vith century, used the *Liberian Catalogue*** for the first centuries, and after 354, documents from various sources; his work possesses a very real, though relative value. (The *Felidan Catalogue* is not the source, but a later abridgement, composed of extracts). For the popes posterior

* *P. L·,* 58, 1052-1120. Recent, ed., Richardson *(Teste u. Uulers.,* XIV, 1, 1896), Bernoulli, 1895; Herding, 1924.

- *Ibid.,* 979-1054. Other ed. F. Oehler, *Corpus hceieseolog.* 1, B. (1856), p. 335-400.

3 Dom Morin, in *Revue B¿u.,* 1907, p. 445-455.

♦ Dom Morin, *Etudes,* I, (1913). p. 36.

s Mgr Duchesne, The *Liber Pontificalis,* 2 vol., Paris. 1886-1894. See also *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'hisl.,* 1898 (t. Will), p. 3S1-417.

6 See vol. I, p. 568.

to Felix IV it was completed by contemporary accounts of excellent authority, which, towards the end, in the IXth century, become very long. Mgr Duchesne, in his edition, adds accounts of the popes up to Martin v (1417-1431).

C) Special Biographies.

We have already mentioned the biographies of Saint Augustine by St. Possidius *, of St. Honoratus of Lerins by St. Hilary of Arles , of the latter by Honoratus of Marseilles3, and those written by Fortunatus4 and Ennodius 5. Two other biographers must be mentioned here, *Eugippius* and *Fulgentius Ferrandus.*

1. Eugippius, an African by birth, and later a monk in Italy, adventured as far as the banks of the Danube with St. Severinus the apostle of Noricum who died in 482. On returning to Naples where he became abbot in 500, he wrote, in 511, a *Life of St. Severinus*(i. This is a very precious historic document dealing with an extremely interesting saint and a very little known period. Eugippius was also the author of an *Augustinian Thesaurus* (extracts from the works of St. Augustine, 352 chapters) very popular in the Middle Ages, no doubt on account of its very marked ascetic nature7.

2. Fulgentius Ferrandus (d. before 546) was a disciple and perhaps a kinsman of the Bishop of Ruspe whom he followed in exile to Sardinia before becoming deacon of Carthage in about 523. He was renowned as a theologian, but his work is now lost. All that remains is 1) The *Life of Saint Fulgentius**, written about 535 (the authenticity of the work is fairly well established ; in any case it possesses definite historical value); 2) a *Breviatio canonum*9 (about 540), bringing together under 232 headings the canons of the Greek councils (according to the Collection termed Isidorian or Spanish), and the canons of the African councils (some of these councils are not otherwise known . The texts arc not arranged in chronological order, but by subject, accordingly as they concern the bishop (1-84), the priest (85-103), the deacon (104-izo;, the clergy (121-142), the councils (143-164), procedure (165-198), baptism (199-205). Lent (206-210), and various other ordinances (211-232). The *letters* of 1·. Ferrandus 10 contain the long and wise answer he made to the two Roman deacons, Pelagius and Anatolius, who had asked his opinion regarding Justinian's attitude to the Three Chapters : he spoke out bluntly against the Emperor.

' See vol. 1, p. 611.
5 See above, p. 161.
3 Sec above, p. 165.
4 See above, p. 214.
5 See above, p. 156.
62, 1167-1200. Ci. *Corfiis* of Vienna, 1886 (t. ivj, ι-n. See André Ba UDRILLART, N. *Sèverin,* (Coll. *Les Saints),* Paris, 1908.
7 *P. L.,* 62, 559-1088.
8 *P. L.,* 65, 117-150.
' T'. Z., 67, 949-962.
10 *P. L.,* 65, 887-95°; 37S-390, 392-394· Mat, *Senft. vet. nova Coll.,* in, 2. 169-184 (letter to Eugippius). And five other unimportant letters.

II. HISTORIES AND CHRONICLES. TRAVEL BOOKS.

The historical works of *Cassiodorus,* the most outstanding of the period, have already been mentioned. There exist others of various kinds, many of which constitute valuable sources. To these we will add a number of travellers' accounts *(Itineraria)* of journeys to Palestine.

A) Histories and Chronicles.

1) Marcellinus Comes, an Illyrian, is the author of a *chronicle*[1] written about 535, dealing chiefly with events in the East from 379 to 534 (the end, up to 548, is from another hand).

2) A. Jordanis published in Italy about 551, a somewat clumsy abridgement of Cassiodorus' History of the Goths[2] and also wrote a synopsis of Universal History entitled *De Summa temporum vel de origine actibusque gentis Romanorum*[3]; the second part deals exclusively with Rome. It is no more than a compilation of ancient writers (551).

3) Victor de Vita, Bishop of Byzacena at the end of the Vth century is chiefly famous for his *History of the Persecution of the Province of Africa in the time of Geiserich and Hunerich, king of the Vandals*[4]. The work was composed after Hunerich's persecution, of which the author was a witness and lor which the work provides excellent evidence. It is written with great feeling, in popular but expressive language. The first part is less valuable. The two appendices to the present editions[5] arc later additions.

4 Liberatus, deacon of Carthage about 560 wrote a *Short History (Breviarium) of* Nestorianism and Monophysitism[6],* from 428 to 553. He was biased in favour of the Three Chapters.

5) Victor de Tunnunum another bishop of North Africa, composed, about 568, a *chronicle'* modelled on that of St. Prosper, extending from the Creation to the year 567.

6) Marius, Bishop of Lausanne, at the end of the vith century, wrote a *continuation* of St. Prosper's chronicle* from 455 to 581.

St. Gildas will be studied below with St. Gregory of Tours[9].

B) Journeys to Palestine [10].

Several are extant from the vith century :

I. *De situ Juda urbisque hierosolymitancef* by Eucherius (Saint?) to Faustus ; a series of geographical notes rather than a travel book ".

---

1 *P. L.,* 51, 913 sq. *Mon. germ, hist.,* 1894 (t. Xi).

9 *De origine actibusque Getarum.* In *Mon. germ, hist.,* 1882, (t. v). See above p. 222. — 3 *Ibid.* —4 *P. L.,* 58, 179-260.—.LW *germ. hist.,* 1879 (t. III).

5 One is a *Passion* of the seven martyrs who suffered in 483 ; the other an *Account of the provinces and cities of Africa,* with an indication of the bishoprics.

6 */. I..,* 68, 969-1052 *(Breviarium causa nestorianorum et eutychianorum).*

1 *Ibid.,* 937-962. —* *P. L.,* 72, 791. — 9 See p. 272.

10 See H. Leclercq, *Itinéraires* in *Did. Arch.,* col. 1841-1022.

" Ed. I'. Geyer, *Corpus* of Vienna, 1898 (1st ed. Labbe 1657) Not in */. I..*—19 The same is to be said of a *Breviarium de Hierosolyma* of the same period.

2. *De situ Terree sancta* ', by Theodosius, an archdeacon writing between 520 and 530.

3. *Antonini Placentini itinerarium*a, an anonymous account of a pilgrimage made to Palestine in 570 by a pious Christian of Placentia. The narrator accompanied Antoninus on his journey.

III. DIONYSIUS THE LESS'.

Chronologïst and Canonist.

Dionysius the Less is the author of the most important canonical work of the Western Church in the vith century. He himself, however, was of Eastern origin, (born in Scythia near the mouth of the Danube); but about 500, while still young, he came to Rome where he lived as a monk and died about 540. He called himself the *Less* through humility, and this name has remained. He was a scholar and chronologist of merit, and obtained the adoption of the Alexandrian 19 year pascal cycle in the East 4. But his chief claim to fame is that of having made the *date of the birth of Jesus Christ the central point of history*, instead of counting the years, as was the custom, from the foundation of Rome (754 B. C.) or from the accession of Diocletian (284 : Diocletian era, or era of the martyrs) 5. The *Dionysian* era, introduced into Italy in about 526, spread to France in the viith century and ended by becoming universal. It is to be regretted that through an error of calculation Dionysius placed the birth of Christ in the year 754 of Rome. It was most probably the year 749.

'Hie influence of Dionysius was most felt in his juridical work. Among his various *translations*6,* several relate to Canon Law, like the famous *collections* which have made him of such great service to posterity 7. He was not, however, the first in this field. 1 here were known collections in Italy from the Vth century8 : one translated from the Greek,

' Ed. P. Geyer, Vienna, 1S98. — 8 *P. L.*, 72, 899-918. Better, P. Geyf.k, *ibid.*

3 General Edition : *P. L., frj,* 9-527. Special editions, see below. Account : II. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* t. 1 (1903), col. 495-498.

4 Epist. *De ratione Pascha (P. L., &],* 19-28, 483-494) and the opusculum *Cyclus decem novennalis,* with *argumenta, ibid,* 493-498, 497-508.

5 This innovation is made in the *Cyclus.* For its history, see B. HOFFMANn, *Hist. Cycli dionysiani,* in A *L., &],* 453-4S4.

6 Treatise of S. Greg, of Nyssa *On the creation oj Man.* Life of St. Pachomius etc... *P. L.,* 67, 347 sq., 4Ó7 sq. — *i P. L.,* 67, 136-230.

8 See A. Tardif, *Hist, des sources du droit can.,* Paris, 1887; C. Maassen, *Geschichte tier Quelleu u. Litt, deshan. Hechts,* i, 1870; Schulte, 1875; G. II. TURNER, *Monumenta inris antio. Eccl. occ..* 1S99.

termed the *Collectio hispana* (chronological) so called because incorporated in the great *Collectio hispana* (systematic), though it was anterior to the latter and formed in another country; the *Prisca* or *Itala,* also of Italian origin and wrongly attributed to Dionysius; perhaps also the *Codex canonicus Ecclesia romance,* published by Quesnel in 1675, and called the Quesnel Collection. It may, however, have been composed in Gaul in the Vth century [1]. Other pre-Dionysian collections also contained, in addition to conciliary canons, extracts from Papal decretals. But none of these will ever possess an authority comparable to Dionysius' collections. The latter went chiefly to Oriental sources, notably a *Greek codex (auctoritas Graea),* far different from the *Codex canonum Ecclesia universa* [2] published and forged by Justel [3]. By his own efforts, Dionysius was destined to supplant his predecessors, both in his collections of Pontifical constitutions and his canonical collections.

The Dionysian collection was not composed at one time. In the first years of the vith century Dionysius first published a *collection of canons* translated by himself; it contained the first 50 Apostolic canons[4], then the canons of a certain number *of* Oriental councils, both oecumenical and merely provincial (Nicea, Constantinople, Chalcedon, Sardica, Ancyra)[5], and lastly 138 canons from diverse councils of Carthage and North Africa[6]. The canons are invariably in chronological order. This did not prejudice the success *of* the work and Dionysius was soon led to undertake a similar compilation of the *decretals of the popes'*[7]. He collected 38, covering the space of a century, from 384 until the accession of the reigning pope, Saint Symmachus (498-514); he omitted several important ones included in earlier collections. Those he gave, however, formed a document of the first rank which at first existed independently; later it was added to the collection of canons, and the whole finally constituted the famous *Dionysian Collection* as known to posterity[8].

Although the canonical work of Dionysius was neither the first of its kind nor the only one of the period, it rapidly obtained great authority. *Saint Caesarius')* at Arles and

[1] *P. L.,* 50, 359 sq. (Ballerini's ed.). See *ibid.,* 947 sq. Ballerini's study of this collection. A. Van Hove, *Comment. Ισναη.,* i, p. 112-113.

[2] *P. L., &j,* 39 94. Justel's notes, *ibid.,* 93-134.

[3] Ballerini, *De antiquis collectionibus... P. L.,* 56, 15 sq.

[4] *P. L.,* 67, 141-148. See vol. i, p. 372.

[5] *Ibid.,* 147-172 (165 canons of various councils), 171-176 (27 canons of Chalcedon), 175-182 (21 canons of Sardica).

[6] *Ibid.,* 181-230. —[7] *Ibid.,* 231-316.

[8] Later, at the request of Pope Hormisdas (d. 523), Dionysius composed anew edition of the canons (except the Apostolic canons) with double Greek and I-atin text. This work is lost. — [9] See above, p. 207.

Fulgentius Ferrandas[1]* had written similar works at the same time. It was that of Dionysius, however, that was quickly adopted by the sovereign Pontiffs, and this partly explains its great popularity. From Rome it gradually spread throughout the West. In the viith century it came to Spain where it was largely used for the Decretals, by the author of the Collectio hispana. Later it was officially transmitted to Charlemagne by Pope Adrian I, a fact which earned it the name of *Collectio hadriana :* this latter is no more than a re-edition of the Dionysian collection with a few additions. Thus, without possessing a truly official character, it was everywhere rightly looked upon as an authority. In spite of its imperfections, it marked an immense advance on all previous works of its kind.

IV. ST. BENEDICT AND MONASTIC LEGISLATION[3].

Saint Benedict is sometimes called the *Father of Inonachism* in the West. : by this it should be understood that he was the chief lawgiver. Before he wrote his monastic rule there existed others; we have already mentioned those of St. Augustine, of Cassian at Marseilles, Honoratus at Lerins, and St. Caesarius at Arles. But a time came when all these were supplanted by the rule of St. Benedict, which may thus have appeared to be the first, since all later forms of Western religious life were influenced by it to a greater or lesser extent.

Saint Benedict was born at Norcia in the Duchy of Spoleto in 480, of rich parents by whom he was given an excellent education. Having been sent to Rome to study,

[1] See above p. 227. On the slightly later work of St. Martin of Braga, see p. 254.

[3] Editions : *P. L.*, 66, 215-932 (text and commentaries). Dom C. Butler, Freiburg, 1912. Cf. Dom Morin, *Revue bén.,* 1912, p. 393-410. Studies: Dom B. Maréchaux, *S'. Benoît,* (life, rule, spirit, doct.). Paris, 1911 (pious work). Dom Hébrard, *S'. Benoît* (Life), Paris, 1922. Dom F. Ryelandt, *Essai sur la physionomie morale de S. B.,* Bruges, 1924. De Luca, 5. *Benedetta* (lifeand rule), Florence. 1924. Dom G. Morin, *L'Idéal monastique,* Maredsous, 1914 (1921, 3). Dom DeI.ATTE, *Comment, sur la règle de S. Benoît,* Paris, 1915. Dom U. BerliÈRE, *L'Ordre monastique des origines au Xtn siècle,* Maredsous, 1921. Dom C. Butler, *Benedictine monachistn,* London, 1919. Dom Besse, *Les mystiques bénéd. des origines au xitu s.,* Maredsous, 1922 (Lectures, posth. edit.). By the same, 5. *Benoît,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 709-717. Dom F. Carrol, *Bénédictins,* in *Diet. Arch.,* col. 664-670. II. Grisar, *Hist, de Borne et des papes,* II, p. II2-131. P. POURRAT, *La spiritualité chrèt., I,* P- 383-399·

he shortly afterwards took flight in order to escape from bad example (about 495). At first he went no farther than *Subiaco,* not far from Rome, where he founded several monasteries. Later, in 529, he quitted this region and settled farther south at Mount Cassino. The monastery he founded there is one of the most famous of Christendom. His sister Scholastica was the head of a neigbouring monastery of women. Both died in 543, Scholastica on February 10th., Benedict on March 21st. The very little we know of their lives is found almost entirely in the linci book of St. Gregory's *Dialogues,* which tells chiefly of the prodigies with which God rewarded the saint's faith and virtue l.*

The influence of St. Benedict has been mainly preserved and spread by his "Rule of the monastic life". This rule, composed of 73 chapters, was not written at one time; Benedict added the last six or seven chapters in a later revision The work as a whole, however, dates from the founding of Monte Cassino (529). The rules of early authors (St. Pachomius, St. Basil, Cassian, St. Augustine: *Ep.* 211) were used by the pious founder3, but somewhat freely and with a rare practical sense. *Three chief characteristics* make it really superior to all earlier rules, whether Latin or Greek : *a)* its exactness and comprehensiveness : it contains laws rather than spiritual maxims and leaves the religious in no doubt as to his duly, at any moment of the day or night ; ¿) the wisdom of its commands, severe enough to overcome nature, moderate enough not to discourage it; *c)* chiefly the stability introduced into the monastic life : St. Basil succeeded only imperfectly in this.

The organisation that Benedict planned for the monastery, centres on three points : a strongly constituted *hierarchy :* the abbot is elected by the community, but his authority is for life and he is aided by officers of his choice (prior, dean, cellarer,..); *work,* not definitively specified, but imposed on all during several hours of the day : St. Benedict was thinking chiefly of manual work; but intellectual work also was to be the lot of a certain number of monks, though it was to be neither exclusive nor preponderating; lastly, *prayer,* above all the celebration of the Divine Office : the *Opus Dei* holds a large place in Benedictine life; the time came when it inspired the Roman Church to impose the canonical office on all its priests. St. Benedict also provided for sanctions against delinquents. His work would seem to be of too administrative a nature if careful attention were not paid to the precious *ascetic elements* it contains and which, as it were, define the spirit of monachism4. It consists first of all in a collection of 72 maxims drawn

1 See on this subject, p. 241.

' For the history of the rule, see Traube's studv, *Textgeschichte...* Munich, 1898. Cf. *Rev. bénld.,* 189S.

3 See II. Grisar, *Hist, de Rome et des papes,* ii, p. 112-120. Cf. Dom Besse, *Ies moines de ΓAfr. rom.,* (Coll. *Science-Relig.}.* Paris, 1903, 2 pamphlets.

4 See Dom Morin, *Op. cit.* See especially Dom Û. Berlière. *L'ascese Mntdictine des origines à la Jin du XIIe s.* Liturgical essay, Maredsous, 1927.

from the Scriptures concerning the means of sanctification (ch. v); then come the especially recommended virtues, obedience (ch. v), recollection in silence (ch. Vi) and above all humility, of which he classes the twelve degrees carefully adapted to the religious life (ch. vil).

The Benedictine rule was destined to have a brilliant future. This it owed, first to its own qualities, but also to *Saint Gregory the Great* who, by attaching it closely to the Roman See and encouraging the apostolate (which action introduced or developed a new element, the ministry) ', multiplied its influence tenfold. Other modifications were introc uced later, especially concerning the organisation of the monasteries into orders and congregations. The essentials of the primitive foundation, however, were preserved. "In the Benedictine rule", says Dom Besse, "there are two elements interwoven one with the other : the first is composed of a mass of principles regarding the religious life, the constitution of the monastery and its working; they' form the doctrine of St. Benedict and are invariable. The second is made up of exact regulations which necessarily reflect the variable influence of individuals and circumstances " [2]3 Thus we have the spectacle in the XII century of the Cistercians, and the monks of Cluny, both claiming to be sons of St. Benedict.

Benedictine monachism [3], already firmly rooted in the organisation set up by the founder, profited greatly by the support it received from Rome and the charm that St. Gregory's writing gave to the figure of the blessed patriarch. It spread rapidly in Italy, where it even supplanted the foundations of Cassiodorus, and also in other countries where it gradually took the place of other forms of religious life. In Gaul, the rules of St. Caesarius [4] and St. Columba the only rules known in the Vlth century[6], where at first modified by that of St. Benedict, and then gave place to it, so that from the vmth to the xnth century it was the almost the only one practised in the West.

' See Dom Ber i.lèr e, *op. cit.,* p. 49-50.

2 Dom Besse, *Did. théol.*

3 On the development and influence of the Benedictine Order, see the above-mentioned study of Doni Berlière. — 4 [5]See above p. 207.

5 See P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 405-408.

6 The establishment of the Benedictines at Glanfcuil in Gaul by St. Maurus in 543, has, unfortunately, no more documentary evidence than a */'ita S. Maun,* written in 836, which is, says Dom H. Leclercq, "a document most patently false" *Did. Arch.,* art. *Glanfcuil,* col. 1283. See the whole art. col. 1283-1319.

SECOND PART

PATRISTIC LITERATURE

from 553 to 800.

CHAPTER I.

Saint Gregory the Great.

Special bibliography :

Editions: *P. L.,* 76-79 (Maurists' ed., 1705). Studies: Denis DE Sainte-Marthe, *Hist, de S. Grégoire le G.,* Rouen, 1697. Ed. Clausier, S'. *Grég. le Gr.,* Lille-Paris, 1887. P. Batiffol, 5. *Grég. le Gr.,* (coll. *Les Saints),* Paris, 1928. Other lives, in Italian, by H. Grisar, Rome, 1904; Tarducci, Rome, 1909; in German, by Boehringer, Stuttgart, 1879, Wolfsgruber, 1890; in English, by H. Dudden, London, 1905; H. Howorth, London 1912. L. PlNGAUD, *La politique de S. Grég. le Gr.,* Paris, 1872. P. Richard, *La monarchie pontificalejusqu'au concile de Trente,* in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* 1924, p. 419 sq. J. 'Fixeront, *La doctrine pénitentielle de S. Grég. le* Gr., in *Mélanges de Pat. et ifhist.,* p. 237-260. DOM U. BERLIÈRE, *D Ordre monastique des origines au xiu siècle,* Maredsous, 1921, p. 46 sq. Dom Ménager, *La contemplation daprès S. Grég. le Gr.,* in *Vie Spirit.,* 1923, p. 242-282. A. SaudREAU, in *La Vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 100-129. H. Leclercq, 5. *Grég. le Gr.,* in *Diet. Arch.,* col. 1753-1776. F. Carrol, *Grégorien (Le Sacramentaire), Ibid.,* col. 1776-1796. P. Godet, *Grégoire (Saint)* in *Diet. théol.,* col. 1776-1781.

I. LIFEl AND CHARACTER.

Saint Gregory was born at Rome, probably in 540. He was of noble birth and it was long thought that he belonged to the illustrious and wealthy family of the xAnicii2. He entered on a political career while still young and

l There are three early lives of St. Gregory : one written by a monk of Whitby about 713 (Gasquet's ed., 1904), another by Paul the Deacon about 770-78*0 (/'. 75, 41-59); lhe third and lengthier, by John the Deacon about 870-880 (A *L.,* 75, 59-242)· They possess little authority beyond that found in the earliest extant sources i. e., St. Gregory's writings.

*· Without sufficient proof, P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 16.

about 570 was already Prefect [1] of Rome. But his upright and noble spirit soon wearied of the vanity of worldly greatness. He yielded to the movement of grace, sold part of his possessions and devoted them to charitable works, founded six monasteries in Sicily and retired to a seventh on his estate on the Caelian hill to which, at a later date, he gave the rule of St. Benedict [2]. This was about 575 : fifteen more years were to pass before he became pope. His religious life, however, was interrupted for six or seven years by his residence in Constantinople as nuncio *(apocrisarius),* from 578 to about 585. Although St. Gregory did not learn Greek in the East, he learnt to know the letters of the alphabet and this was destined to be of great use to him in later years. He remained a monk at heart and it was at Constantinople that he began his great ascetic work, the *Moralia,* which he did not finish until 590. On his return he again entered his monastery and was elected abbot. He was made pope on the death of Pelagius II in 590, and after a few vain attempts at refusal, had to submit to his new responsibility.

Although *Saint Gregory* occupied the See of Rome for only fourteen years (590-604) his eminent virtues merited him the name of *Great.* Endowed with vigorous common sense and a genius for practical affairs, he also possessed, like St. Leo, in an outstanding degree, the *art ofgovernment.* An admirable witness of this is provided by his *Registrant Epistolarum* which still contains 848 letters [3] classed in 14 books. This represents but a very small part of the original collection compiled by Gregory himself. Nothing could reveal better than these letters his practical turn of mind and his untiring activity, as well as the temper of his supple and commanding intellect. Mgr Batiffol [4] remarks in him three especial gifts that are well expressed by these three words, so usual with Gregory : *rectitudo,* an expression which signifies " faithfulness to the law, to the rule, to the canons ", and also " that which we imply in our old word fidelity *(loyauté)* and the Romans in *fides,* with, in addition, a suggestion of command and obligation *discretio,* i e.,

[1] Rather than *Pudor.* Cf. P. BATIFFOL, *ibid.,* p. 17.

[2] According to a tradition that is not absolutely sure.

[3] *L.,* 77, 441-1328. *Mon. germ. hist.* (Ewald and Hartmann's ed.) t. 1-n, p. 1891-1899.

[4] *Op. cit.,* p. 228.

"common sense", or "discretion in the application of the law, in the choice of the best decision, in determining the best possible course of action," or again "a sense of opportunity" or lastly, in a word, moderation; *blandimentum* by which a chief, really zealous of his duty, "knows how to make himself loved without seeking to please unduly". Though one or other of these latter traits may momentarily have been obscured by some irritation or stubbornness, the first, *rectitudo,* never failed, and this it was that made the eminent beauty of Saint Gregory's character.

We must also observe Gregory's resolute ardour *in his attempts to win the Barbarians to Christ*[1]. He well understood what very real resources these new peoples hid under a rude exterior. The *Gallo-Roman* Bishops had shown the way by converting the Franks and the Burgundians[2] during the vith century. At the moment that Gregory came to the pontifical throne, Spain also was returning to the Church[3]. In both these countries he set himself with all his force to foster the movement that had begun. The *Lombards* who had invaded Italy about 570, were still either Pagans or Arians: Gregory urged the bishops of this country to work for their conversion, and pressed the bishops of the Italian isles (Sicily Sardinia, Corsica) to eradicate the remains of Paganism. But *England,* above all, attracted him, and to him and his sending of St. Augustine and forty Benedictine monks is due the honour of her conversion. At the same time, with unwearying love, but also unshakable energy, he waged active *warfare on the vices* which seemed to be stifling the whole world. In one of his letters he compares the Church herself to "an old and worm-eaten ship, afloat on the deep, breaking up as in a shipwreck"[4]. But he kept faith in Providence and thus paved the way for new triumphs for the Church and the popes; be founded their "paternal supremacy over the new-born royalties and the new nations, which were to be called France, Spain, England. Truly it was he who inaugurated the Middle Ages, modern society and Christian civilisation"[5].

Saint Gregory has also the honour of having initiated the temporal power of the popes. The possessions of the Roman Church, termed the *patrimony of St. Peter,* were at this time considerable. Careful administration enabled him to acquire great revenues, which were for the most part employed in succouring the widespread misery of the Roman population. In return, this public benefactor was not long in being recognised as the true head of Rome, especially as the nominal sovereign, the Emperor of Constantinople, did not in fact exercise his authority in the city, and, as Duchesne says, "it is a historical" puerility to insist on the pope as an imperial subject in the vith, vnth and

[*] See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* ch. v, vu.
[1] See above, p. 209-211.
[3] See p. 256.
[4] *Epist.,* 1. i, 4.
[5] P. Godet, *op. cit.,* col. 1777.

VIIIth centuries1. The donation made by Pepin the Short *(7Z6)* put the finishing touch to a work begun a hundred and fifty years previously7.*

Saint Gregory, like his predecessors, was sensible of his universal authority in the Church. Though he does not say so in such splendid terms as did St. Leo, he affirms it no less forcefully, declaring especially that the Bishop of Rome is the *caput fidei* and that it is he alone who can grant exemptions from the universal law λ But the closest resemblance between St. Leo and St. Gregory lies in the fact that both "so to speak, made these ideas, which already existed before their time, become *a part of the daily life of their contemporari'es,* and by their incessant intervention in all parts of the Christian world, made of their oecumenical authority, a *universally felt reality* " 4. St. Gregory, however, rejected the title of " ¿Ecumenical Patriarch ", not only for the Bishop of Constantinople (at that time, John IV the Faster, if not the first to adopt it, at least proudly boasted of it) 5, but also for himself, in order, he said, not to prejudice the claims of others, even indirectly, "quia videlicet si unus patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen caeteris derogatur"6. He himself adopted the title of "Servus servorum Dei " 7.

This first monk to become pope, nourished a special regard for the religious life. Especially should be noticed the Dart he played in the development of *Benedicline monachisi** which, thanks to his efforts, became the conquering army of the Roman Church. " However", says Berlière9, "Gregory took monasticism just as it was instituted by

* Mor Duchesne, *Les premiers temps de l'Etat pontifical,* Paris, 1904. p. 21.

3 Nevertheless, St. Gregory in no way avoided the Emperor's authority. From a political viewpoint he remained loyally attached to the Republic, i. e., the old empire, then represented by Byzantium, on which Rome was dependent. He endeavoured to pacify Italy by establishing a normal *modus vivendi* between the Byzantines and the Lombards, whose States, if this policy had been successful, would have become " the marches of Byzantine Italy"; and thus, perhaps, the primacy of the old " non-germanic " empire might have been maintained and the break between East and West prevented. P. BATIFFOL, *op. cit.,* p. 231. — 3 *Epist.,* 1. in, 56.

4 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dot>m.,* in, p. 364-365.

5 This title appears to go back to the schism of Acacius. It was maintained or resumed afterwards by the patriarchs not estranged from Rome who understood οικουμένη to mean the empire. It was nevertheless ambiguous and dangerous. Cf. P. Batiffol, *Op. cit.,* p. 205. See also S. Vailhé, in *Echos d'Orient,* 190S (t. II), p. 65 sq., 161 sq.

6 *Epist.,* 1. V, 43. Cf. *ibid.,* vin, 30. — 7 *Epist..* 1. xm, 1.

8 On monastic legislation in general, see P. Batiffol's note, *op. cit.,* p. 117-118.

9 *L'Ordìe monastique,* p. 49.

Benedict; he created nothing new; he fortified and consolidated the work of the legislator of Monte Cassino. With his authority, were consecrated all the fundamental principles found in the Benedictine rule, in everything that concerns the practice of poverty and chastity, the vow of stability, the divine office, spiritual readings, commerce with the outside world". By thus developing the interior life he prepared valuable aids for himself. This he realised, and did not hesitate in calling them to the priesthood and the apostolate, although previously he had threatened to punish every abbot and monk in the diocese of Ravenna* who consented to be raised to the priesthood or holy orders. This move of Gregory's was destined to have great consequences, not only for the Benedictine order, which he had bound with such strong ties to the Chair of Peter and assured of a brilliant future, but also for the whole Church.

Though greatly absorbed in these manifold occupations, the pope did not neglect the flock confided to his care. As witness of his pastoral activity we possess his *homilies* (on the Gospels and on Ezechiel) which will be treated below, as well as the *Dialogues* dating from the same period (593), a pious work meant for the edification of all the faithful. The *Pastoral,* on the other hand, written about 591, reveals the pope's anxious care for the training of good priests. Nothing was more necessary at the time, even in Catholic Gaul, where the clergy, often composed of neophytes and sometimes intriguers and opportunists supported by the princes, had need of a thorough reform. This evil had so progressed by the end of the VIth century that Gregory urgently called for councils to find a remedy. His zeal, careless of no detail is manifest even in the liturgy, of which he was one of the first organisers[1]. He died on March 12th, 604, having fully realised the magnificent ideal which, from the very first days of his pontificate, he had conceived as worthy of a true pastor, shepherd of the flock.

II. WORKS.

Saint Gregory, in addition to his *correspondence*[3], has left written *oratorical, moral and liturgical works.* We do not refer to his exegetical works since the homilies and the "Moralia", in spite of their biblical foundation, are moral and pastoral works rather than exegesis[5] in the right meaning of the term. Some *commentaries,* indeed, have been ascribed

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 46-50. See also P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 227.
[3] For all these matters, see the works.
[3] See above, p. 235.

to him [1] (on the 1st Book of Kings, the Song of Solomon and the penitential Psalms), but their authenticity is more than doubtful; the same is to be said of a *Harmony of some witnesses of Holy Scripture* [2].

A) Oratorical works. These are composed of a double series of homilies, one on the Gospels, the other on Ezechiel.

The homilies on the Gospels[3], forty in number, in 2 books each containing 20, are a series of instructions made to the faithful on the chief texts of the Gospels read in the churches, especially on Sundays, throughout the liturgical year ; these are familiar talks characterised by an unlaboured, easy, and cordial eloquence. They appear to have been composed in the year 5VO-591 ; the first 20 were read to the people by a notary in the presence of the pope whose infirmities precluded him from s leaking in public ; the others which he preached himself, were taken down by stenographers. When they began to be passed round among the people, Gregory decided to publish them all himself, about 592. Many extracts from them are found in the liturgy[4].

fhe homilies on Ezechiel[5], were also preached to the people in 593. But the pope had not the time to comment on the whole of the prophet. He contented himself with explaining the first three chapters and the beginning of the fourth, in the 12 homilies of the 1st book, and chapter 40 (description of the new temple) in the 10 homilies of the second. Here, just as in the homilies on the Gospels, the moral viewpoint is predominant. It may be perhaps affirmed that these instructions attain a higher and more ascetic tone, and bear a greater resemblance to the Moralia[6].

B) The Moral works comprise the *Moralia,* the *Pastoral* and the *Dialogues.*

The Moralia or *Expositio in Librum Jobi,* a veritable repertory of casuistry and asceticism, of incalculable richness,

[1] *P. L., 79,* 9-467 ; 471-548 ; 549-658. However the *Commentary on the 1st Book of Kings* here mentioned, the work of the Abbot Claude, usually looked on with suspicion on account of Gregory's own words, *inutilius permutatum (Ep.* XII, 24), should rather, according to Fr. de la Taille, be regarded as an authentic witness to the teaching of St. Gregory who found therein his ideas *" in utilius permutatum".* Cf. *Recherches de Sc. Rei.,* 1916, p. 472-473. See the *Rev. béned.,* 1929, p. 204-217 for article favouring attribution of 2 homilies on the Song of Solomon to St. Gregory-. — [3] *P. L.,* 76, 659-678.

[3] *Ibid.,* 1075-1312.. Early. Fr. tr. (anon), Paris, 1665. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 69-76.

[4] " The homilies on the Gospels do not belie their title. Ihey became deservedly models of pastoral eloquence and preaching, and " one of the most widely-read and venerated books of the Middles Ages'. (J. de Ghellinck). P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 76.

[5] Λ Z., 76, 785-1072. French tr. (anon), Paris. 1747. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 94-99·

[6] There remain no traces of Gregory s preaching after 593.

[i] *P. L.,* 75, 509-1162, 76, 9-782. Early Fr. tr., (anon), Paris 1666 (new ed., Lyons, 1692). See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 99-109.

"rendered popular the secrets of asceticism by developing the noblest traditions of biblical exegesis, and during the Middle Ages was considered worthy to serve as a base for the teaching of moral theology" The *text of the Book of Job* which runs like a thread through Gregory's book was *for* him often no more than an apt theme lending itself to various *developments.* As he himself declares in his preface[1], he thinks it his duty, if the occasion arises, to leave his subject, when by so doing he can the better edify his reader.

His method is threefold : "Modo per *expositionis* ministerium, modo per *contemplationis* ascensum, modo per *inoralitatis* instrumentum". This Gregory himself explains : " Primum quidem fundamenta *historia* ponimus; deinde per significationem *typicam,* in arcem fidei, fabricam mentis erigimus; ad extremum quoque per *moralitàtis* gratiam quasi superducto ædificium colore vestimus"[34] But the author very often deliberately neglects the liteial sense in favour of the spiritual sense which lifts him up to the contemplation of the mysteries of faith ; or the moral sense wich reveals the duties of the Christian and the means of acquiring perfection. This enormous work, the longest written by the pope, fills 35 books, subdivided into chapters. The saint's doctrinal authority derives especially from this writing. It was composed mainly for monks or advanced souls ; the author remarks that it would be more harmful than useful to poorly instructed Christians. Begun at Constantinople at the instance of Saint Leander, it was not finished until after 590 and dedicated to the same St. Leander, then Bishop of Seville.

The Pastoral *(Liber regula pastoralis)** was written in 591 and dedicated to John of Ravenna who had reproached the pope with having attempted to avoid his supreme dignity. Like St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. John Chrysostom, he made his excuses by underlining the greatness and the dignity of the priesthood, insisting especially, however, on the *duties of the priest.* The book is divided into three parts : the single chapter that forms the fourth is really a conclusion urging the priest to look into his own soul in order to know himself. The *1st part* explains the qualités necessary for entering into holy orders and the hierarchy :

1 P. Godet, *of', cit.,* col. 177S.

9 *Epistola missoria,* c. 11.

3 *Ibid.,* c. 11. lit. Thus each passage is thrice explained; but the second and chiefly the third explanations are those on which the author insists.

I... ηη, 13-128. Fr. tr., Prompsault, Paris, 1847; Raynaud (in *Ix Prêtre (faOrès les Pères),* Toulouse. 1840;]. Bousset, Collection *Pax,* Bruges, 1928. See P. Batiffol, *of. cit.,* p. 85-94.

"Ad culmen quisque regiminis *qualiter veniat"*; the 2nd points out the life (virtues and works) that priests should lead Ad hoc rite perveniens *qualiter vivat"*; the 3rd gives the rules for the preaching and guidance that is to be given to the faithful : " Bene vivens *qualiter doceat* ".

This question of Christian eloquence had been too well treated by St. Augustine [1] to render it needful for St. Gregory to re-open the subject. And in reality he scarcely essays to do so, concentrating rather on a description *of* the varied characters of the faithful, so that the priest may learn to make his preaching apt. Many of these descriptions contain no more than elementary generalities, though several reveal a number of acute observations. The first two parts contributed efficaciously to raise the clergy to the height of the very noble yet practicable ideal that is here exposed with such force and authority. The work proved immensely popular from its very first appearance.

The Dialogues [2] found perhaps even greater favour in the Middle Ages, an age that was fond of reading of the Christian prodigies which are here found on every page. The Dialogues are meant for all the faithful and tell of a number of miracles and extraordinary events which Gregory witnesse, or had received, as he says, from reliable sources. The *first three books* tell of holy persons living in Italy, of whom very little is known, save St. Benedict (the second book is wholly devoted to him and this first biography is a masterpiece of its kind); in the *fourth book* is found a series of marvellous happenings, all witnessing the survival of the soul after death, the existence of purgatory, and the possibility of succouring the faithful departed, especially by the offering of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Gregory has been reproached with credulity. He does not, in fact, criticise the facts he narrates, intending only to edify the faithful. These Dialogues were used as a model by the hagiographers of the Middle Ages. They also helped more than any other writing to spread the cult of St. Benedict and the love of his rule [3],

C) St. Gregory's liturgical works [4] are found in many forms, though the authenticity of some has been contested.[3]

[1] See vol. I, p. 653 and p. 658.
[2] *P. L., TJ,* 147-430. (Latin text and Gr. trans.). See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 138-156.
[3] P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 152-156.
[4] See D. Cabrol, *op. cit.,* p. 152-156.

i. The Ordinary of the Mass still contains several prayers and formulas that he introduced : the recitation or singing *of the Kyrie Eleison* alternately with the *Christe eleison :* the singing of the *alleluia* after the gradual, during the whole year, instead of during Easter time only : recitation of the *Pater* after the canon [1], and also, probably, the *libera nos* that follows[2]; lastly, he added to the canon a part of the *Hanc igitur,* from the *diesque nostros* to the end [3]

2. There is still extant a Gregorian sacramentary i. e., an ancient *missal* ascribed to Gregory and containing proper masses for the whole of the liturgical year. It "comes as a kind *of* revision or summary of the *Gelasian* Sacramentary, and is not a new creation so much as an adaption of the early sacramentary *of* the Roman Church to the liturgical conditions of the time (end of the VI th cent.)"[4]. The majority of liturgical historians maintain that it was written at this period and also attribute it to St. Gregorys, in spite of the authority of Mgr Duchesne who does not think it earlier than the vili th century, and who calls it the "Sacramentary of Hadrian [i] "[6].

3.A Gregorian Antiphonal[7] is also attributed by some critics to a Vlll-ixth century writer[8]; nevertheless, even in the absence of direct and contemporary evidence, the tradition ascribing it to Gregory is sponsored by serious and consistent critics[9].

4. Gregorian chant[10-12] the ancient Roman melody used in singing the Psalms. It was not invented by St. Gregory but he developed it not only by organising the *Schola cantorum* b it also by direct means. Some of these were analogous to the action taken by other popes from the vth to the Vili th century". But he also rendered it more individual, better adapted to the rhythm, simplicity, and harmony that characterises this ecclesiastical chant[13]. M. Gcvaert denies this honour to St. Gregory and accords it to Gregory II or Gregory **III**'[3]. Recent discussions have shed no further light on the question u.

1 See *Epist.,* ix, 12.

3 Cf. P. BATIFFOL, *Leçons sur la messe,* 1927, p. 281.

3 *Liber Pontificalis,* t. I, p. 312 (Duchesne's ed.).

4 D. Cabrol, *op. cit.,* coi. 1779. — 5 See *ibid.,* col. 1790.

6 Who sent it to Charlemagne, between 784 and 791. Cf. DUCHESNE, *Les origines du culte chrétien,* 1908, p. 124-126. Text in *P. L.,* 78, 25-240, (Don Menard's ed., 1642). Recent critical ed., II. Lietzmann, 1921.

7 *P. L.,* 78, 641-724. The *Antiphonal* the collection of parts of the Mass with musical notation and should be distinguished from the *Resfionsal,* a collection of antiphons and responses from the office : *ibid.,* 725-850. The 8 hymns that follow *(JP. L.,* 78, 849-852), retained by the Benedictine editors, are now commonly rejected.

b Especially by F.-A. Gevaert, (art. in *Le bien public,* 23-24 Dec. 18S9).

' Chiefly i)0M. G. Morin, *Les véritables origines du chant grégorien,* Maredsous, 1S90. See H. Leclercq, *Antiphonaire,* in *Did. Arch.,* col. 2443-2461. But see also the recent study by Dom R. Van Doren, *Etude sur Vinfluence musicale de Pabbaye de Saint-Gall,* 1925.

'q See the authors mentioned in the previous note.

" P. Batiffol, *(Hist. du Bréviaire romain,* p. 54 sq.).

12 Dom Morin *(op. cit.).* — *3 *Op. cit.*

'* See C. Callewaert, *De origine canius gregoriani,* in *Ephemerides liturgica,* 1926 (2 articles).

III. ST. GREGORY'S DOCTRINE.

A) The Doctor in general.

Saint Gregory is one of the great Doctors of the Church and one of the most favoured masters in the Middle A"es. His of course was a different influence from that of Boethius, Cassiodorus, and Isidore of Seville, for he was not, and had no desire to be, either a philosopher or a scholar. Like Saint Ambrose he was pre-eminently a moralist. He did not possess such literary gifts as the Bishop of Milan ; but his style was unaffected and thus avoided the verbosity and studied seeking after effect that spoilt so many contemporary works. Moreover, this very simplicity lends to his prose, together with the sobriety so fitting to the Bishop of bishops, a clarity so lucid that his ideas gain in forcefulness. This was one of Gregory's outstanding gifts, especially when he treated moral questions.

He was not a speculative theologian. Mgr. Batiffol [1] remarks that writing of the mysteries he even "says that the man who seeks therein for reasons, finds them not and is drowned in an abyss of doubt : the articles of faith are to be believed, not closely searched" [2]. But it would be unjust[3] to make him "responsible for the impoverishment of general and theological culture in the West which followed on the break up of the Roman institutions and the coming of the Barbarian kingdoms. He was no more responsible than Isidore of Seville. Even Boethius, had he been pope, would not have brought Aristotle's philosophy to the West in his time, or raised up Albert the Great in the Vlth century !" [4]. St. Gregory, then, did not create the mentality of his time, yet he was truly a man of that time, who knew its weaknesses and set himself to combat them. It was for this motive that he interested himself especially in the moral elements of Augustine's works. These latter were especially necessary at a time when the arrogance of the victors and the despair of the oppressed seemed to have unleashed a swarm of passions. In this sort, at least, St. Gregory maintained the Augustinian tradition, and thus

1 *Op. cit.,* p. 229. — 2 *Moral.,* vi, 19.

3 Mgr. BATIFFOL, *(op. cit.,* p. ni) makes this remark for the benefit of H. von Schubert, A. Harnack, R. Seeberg.

4 P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* 229-230.

paved the way, indirectly and from afar, for the intellectual renascence of the XIIth century, which owed so much to the Bishop of Hippo.

St. Gregory's Augustinism is undeniable. The agreement of the master and the disciple on characteristic points is evident, *a)* Like St. Augustine, St. Gregory not only preaches the need of *prevenient grace,* even for the beginning of faith and good works*, but also absolutely gratuitous *predestination* to grace and glory, as in the case of the good thief[3]. Æ) He judges that *unbaptised children* are condemned to positive punishment in hell[3]. *d) Angels* are pure incorporeal spirits, unequal in dignity, divided into 9 orders each having its own prerogatives and functions[4]. The good angels are set in charge over the Church, nations and individuals ;[5] the bad angels make war on humankind but are unable to do harm without divine leave[6]. St. Gregory's *eschatology* is steeped in St. Augustine's ideas. It must, however, be added that he thought the end of the world to be imminent[7];* as was generally believed at that time. Though he never made it an article of faith, the castastrophic condition of contemporary society must have strengthened this opinion. He combated the error of the *misericordes*[3], who, even after their refutation by St. Augustine, continued to deny the eternity of hell[9]. He taught on the other hand the temporal nature of purgatory, the efficacy of prayers for all suffering souls and especially the Sacrifice of the Mass *[0].

As St. Gregory was eminently a spiritual guide, his *spiritual and pastoral teaching* will be explained here, with a preliminary note on *penance,* since, his teaching on this has not always been well understood.

B) Penitential discipline

It should first be noted that St. Gregory, like many early authors, often stresses the advantages and efficacy of *penance in general* or the *virtue op penance,* without any allusion to canonical or sacramental penance; thus it is in the Pastoral*[2], which may seem surprising. It should be remarked however "that the pope's purpose in this writing is not exactly to teach how one may efface one's sins, but rather the measures to take in order not to fall again and in order to cure the vices that lead to sin"'[3]. The pope in his exhortations gradually leads the penitent to this end, first by inspiring him with deep feelings of fear,

[1] *Moral.,* XVI, 30. This grace however is far from excluding human activity. The work is imputable to God and to man : " Bonum quippe quod agimus et Dei est et nostrum : Dei per praevenientem gratiam : nostrum per obsequentem liberam voluntatem". *Moral.,* XXXIII, 40.

[3] *Moral.,* XXVII, 63, 64. — [3] *Moral.,* ix, 32. See above p. 198.

[4] See above p. 100. Cf. *Moral.,* II, 8; iv, 8; XXXII, 48.

[5] *Moral.,* IV, 55. — [6] *Moral.,* II, 63, 64.

[7] *In Evang., horn,* IV, 2. Cf. P. BATIFFOL, *op. cit.,* p. 72-73.

* See vol. I. p. 712. — ' *Moral.,* XV, 21. — « *Dialog.,* IV, 55.

[11] See J. Tixeront, *Milanas,* p. 237-260 : *Hist. Dogm.,* m, p. 187-414.

" *Past,* in, 28 sq. — [13] J. Tixeront, *op. cit.,* p. 240.

then hope, and lastly the love of God, the source of a true purpose of amendment and a change of life. When such penance is perfect. Gregory insists on its efficacy, and in this all modern theology and ancient tradition is in agreement with him. Yet this does not imply that he rejected the sacrament. If he spoke more particularly of the virtue, it was because in his time "the *penance-sacrament* or discipline was much more *rarely* practised than in our days, and that even in the sacrament or discipline, the part of *satisfaction* or expiation (by interior and exterior penance) held first place and drew most attention"[1]. As we have said, penitential discipline (or the sacrament) since the vth century has been subject to an *important evolution,* which was already well in train in the time of St. Gregory[2]. It could not therefore escape the pope's vigilant notice, even though at Rome "the pre-eminently traditional town", it lagged behind, and the pope tolerated rather than accepted it.

As we know, the penance-sacrament entails, in addition to the *virtue* of penance which is expressed by *satisfactory* acts controlled by the Church, also *confession,* with which the "actio pænitentiæ" opens, and the *absolution* with which it ends. These last two acts are the specific elements of the sacrament. Tixeront says[3]: "Saint Gregory gives his views on these two points in three or four most important passages of his writings. The most remarkable is homily xxvi on the Gospels, n° 4-6". Here he first affirms "the principle which constitutes the whole basis of penitential discipline"[4]. He designates the bishops as holding this *power,* but he does not exclude the priests, who, at Rome since pope Marcellus (304-309), played an important part in this ministry. The power of absolution implies the right of knowing the sins and consequently the duty of penitents to accuse themselves: St. Gregory speaks of this accusation in terms which point to sacramental *confession.* The bishop must also know that *satisfaction* is made before remitting sins by absolution. And this is not a mere declaration of the fact of remission made by God. Although Gregory, like St. Augustine, compares the confessor to the Apostles who unbound Lazarus already risen and living, this text must be read in the light of all the others. Both Saint Gregory and Saint Augustine appear to have strained the comparison, the better to establish the parallelism; yet perfect penance often brings spiritual life to the penitent before he receives absolution; lastly, the latter always supposes a beginning of life, which is shown by the simple fact of having recourse to the priest. It cannot be affirmed that Gregory was ignorant of the penance-sacrament, in spite of the fact that he nowhere mentions the *private form* that was then becoming more and more general in the Church.

C) Ascetic and mystical doctrine.

1) Ascetic doctrine. There is no doubt that of all the early authors, St. Gregory spoke most often of contemplation, and it has rightly been said that "the spirit of Saint Gregory

[1] J. Tixeront, *op. cit.,* p. 238. Cf. *ibid.,* p. 244.
[2] See above p. 136-138. — [3] *Op. cit.,* p. 246.
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 246.

is the spirit of contemplation " 1. He was far from despising the *active life,* however, whether in his own life, one of the busiest and most fruitful, or in his writings. He compares the active life, not as something contrary but as a lower degree, with the *contemplative life,* which he looks upon as the unitive way, the perfect life (perfect prayer and works)2. For him, the active life is the life of virtue, of good works; it corresponds to the illuminative and the purgative way. He does not name the latter expressly, but evidently knows of them, since he insists on the resistance to carnal passions. Moreover, he considers this active life rather as a simple, "work of preparation, a clearing of the ground ". Compared with the other, the active life to Gregory's mind is essentially ascetic and should lead to the mystical state. In this he follows St. Augustine whose 3* terminology he borrows *(vita activa, vita contemplativa),* as did Julianus Pomarus4. Cassian prefers to say : *vita actualis* and *vita theoretica* 5, while Clement of Alexandria usually has *life offaith* and *life ofgnosis* \ But all these authors in spite of the difference in terms are agreed on essentials.

Asceticism, supposes a gradual advance towards perfection. The *first stage,* or the fight against the passions, may be reduced to the uprooting of the *capital vices.* These St. Gregory classifies according to Cassian 7 with slight modifications 8.* The *second stage* consists in the acquisition of virtues, which takes place only by degrees 9. Gregory gives special import to the four moral virtues 10 and still more to the three theological virtues, without which nothing is pleasing to God11. These virtues achieve fulness through the *seven gifts* of the Holy Ghost, which fortify the soul " contra stultitiam " (wisdom), " contra hebetudinem " (understanding), " contra praecipitationem " (counsel), " contra timorem " (fortitude), "contra ignorantiam" (knowledge), "contra duritiam " (piety), " contra superbiam " (fear)I2. Since this teaching of St. Gregory's obviously tends to mysticism *3,

1 *Lex lenitarum. La formation sacerdotale d'après S. Grig, le Grand,* Paris, 1922. — 2 *Moral.,* Vi, 56-61, and *passim.*

3 See vol. I, p. 701. — * See above p. 181. — 5 See p. 600, vol. I.

6 See vol. I, p. 597. — *i* See vol. I, p. 185.

8 *Moral.,* XXXI, 87. — » *Moral.,* v, 33.

,o *Moral.,* II, 76. *In Ezech.,* bk. I, IV, 8; bk. II, X, 18.

" *In Ezech.,* bk. n, iv, 4.

12 *Moral.,* II, 77; xxv, 15. *In Ezech.,* bk. I, VII, 7.

13 *Moral.,* XXXI, 102.

we must here particularly stress its relations with contemplation.

He observes first that the active life is absolutely necessary and in this regard takes precedence. Of course he also often affirms that in very many ways contemplation is superior to action, but inasmuch as their necessity is concerned, action takes first place, for no one can be saved without good works though one may go to heaven without being a contemplative r. He nevertheless maintains the (relative) necessity of contemplation for at least two classes of persons. First, for *preachers :* in contemplation they "come to rekindle the flame of their zeal; by coming into contact, as it were, with the splendour from on high, they take fire. In the midst of exterior works, no matter how good they may be, they would soon lose their ardour, were they not ever careful to warm themselves at the fire of contemplation... the dryness of their soul would otherwise dry up the words of their preaching"2. All those who wish to achieve perfection, must also acid to the exercises of the active life, the *renunciations* of the contemplative, so as to obtain the eminent graces it brings with it, especially the gifts of contemplation λ Though St. Gregory frequently makes ;relatively) perfect *works* a preliminary condition of contemplation, he also teaches that these works will not, in fact, acquire their true and full perfection unless the soul is illuminated by the higher graces of contemplation. The latter is not continuous and should merely prepare the soul for the good works in the midst of which it will retain the strength-giving memory of the sweetness of God 4.

Among the remote or general dispositions that prepare a soul to receive the graces of contemplation, in addition to *love* which brings the desire for heavenly things, *fear* which causes them to be regarded with awe when they are

' Una nobis in necessitate est, altera in voluntate. *In Ezech.,* bk. I, iv, io.

3 *Moral.,* XXX, 8.

3 *Moral.,* Vi, 58-59. Cf. *Ibid.,* 57. Here these two lives are compared to the two eyes without which man is obviously imperfect. Nevertheless, not all can give themselves with profit to contemplation, especially those uneasy souls *(inquieti spiritus),* who must first becalmed by ascetic practice, and who may perhaps never go beyond the exercises of the " active life .

4 Sicut bonus ordo vivendi est ut ab activa in contemplativam tendatur, ita plerumque utiliter a contemplativa animus ad activam reflectitur, ut per hoc quod contemplativa mentem accenderit, perfectius activa teneatur. *In Ezech.,* bk. π, ii, ii.

attained[1] and the perfect works[2] already mentioned, St. Gregory insists on *a) humility :* " Lumen enim intelligentiæ humilitas aperit, superbia abscondit "[3]; *b) recollection :* the soul must enter into itself *(se ad se colligat*], in order to reach God;[4] he who bears his heart within, receives the light of contemplation[5]; *c) death to the world* and to oneself, to such an extent that contemplation may be compared to the tomb[6]. This concept, however, is negative. The positive idea may be seen in the following paragraph.

2) Mystical teaching. Saint Gregory sometimes gives the name of contemplation *(contemplationis exercitatio)* to an exercise that appears to be merely the immediate preparation for contemplation in the true sense of the word[7]. It consists in the consideration of various objects calculated to raise the soul to God. In a general way he calls these objects *superna, (eterna, et sublimia* or *sacramenta ccelestia* or *sacramenta spiritualia*[8]. These are the divine perfections seen either in themselves or in creatures[9]; the knowledge of the soul itself will lead to a knowledge of the divine nature; but especially the blessed humanity of Christ[10]. Yet all that is not strictly contemplation. So far " man has made efforts to climb as high as possible on the mountain of contemplation, but there are heights he is unable to scale because he does not receive sufficient strength from ordinary grace ".

The soul's search for God, even in the contemplative life, is not without labour; it costs something to tear oneself away from material things in order to be united with God One must wrestle with one's soul as Jacob wrestled with the angel; sometimes the fight is won tvhen God suddenly, with a swift grace, communicates His sweetness; then natural weakness returns, though the experience has not been in vain[11]. It is usually in meditating on the *Scriptures* that one is usually raised up to God; meditating them in such a way that one endeavours not only to understand the text and the moral lessons it inculcates, but also to find therein either explicitly or symbolically, the mysteries of faith, the objects of loving contemplation[*3]. This meditation in the form of

[*] *Moral.,* VI, 58. — [3] *Moral.,* VI, 60.

[3] *Moral.,* XXV, 30. Cf. *ibid.,* I, 58; IX. 26; XXX, 64.

[4] *hi Ezech.,* bk. II, V, 9.

[5] *Qui cor intus habet, ipse quoque lumen contemplationis suscepit, hl Ezech.,* bk. H, V, 18. — [6] *Moral.,* V, 8. —[7] *In Ezech.,* bk. II, I, 7.

[8] *Moral.,* v, 56; XXX, 53. *In Ezech.,* bk. 11, VII, 1. — [9] *Moral.,* v, 52.

[10] Especially Ills Passion, which should be the spiritual food of the Christian.

[11] Est autem in contemplativa vita magna mentis contentio cum sese ad cælcstia erigit. *In Ezech.,* bk. 11, 11, 12. — [12] *Ibid.,* 12. — [*3] See above p. 240.

contemplative prayer becomes especially easy and fruitful from a *spiritual point of view, as well as exegetic, when contemplative wisdom accords an increase[2] of "spiritual understanding" *(spiritualis intelligentiæ)* [3].

Contemplation in the true sense, symbolised by Rachel and Mary (sisters of Leah and Martha, who represent the active life) [4], is sometimes compared to a mountain, inasmuch as it is the terminus of the mystics' ascent [5]; or to a tomb[6] on account of the separations it exacts. It is called a repose or a silence [7] because it is received rather than produced: it is, indeed, a perception of the Holy Ghost, a *perception of God* through the Holy Ghost[8], a grace which, moreover, is vouchsafed under the most varied forms [9]. St. Gregory considers it chiefly as a supernatural wisdom [10], or as a kind of intuition of God, due to a grace that reveals and causes Him, in some sort, to be seen [11] and to be heard [12], in the measure that any creature can see and hear Him in this world.

It is indeed noteworthy that St. Gregory whoso exalted contemplation and described its highest forms, not perhaps methodically [*3] but in a way that betrays his knowledge of its sublime gifts, should have shown himself on the other hand, so careful to put limits to these gifts in the present life. The divine essence itself is not perceived in contemplation [*4]: the soul is sensible that is does not see the Truth as it is, and that in itself supposes a great grace [*5]. The contemplative vision is but a remote vision of God; [*6] a vision in the night "for as long

[*] It is chiefly from this viewpoint that one must judge St. Gregory. His exegesis is more often than not fantastic and his accommodations of the Scriptures suffer somewhat as a result (see the conditions of accommodation, vol. I, p. 29). But if his works are regarded as a moral catechesis or as mystical elevations they possess real value; often they are true "contemplative meditations".

[3] In the latter case the contemplative meditations are perfect in the sense indicated in vol. I, p. 26-27.

[3] *In Ezech.*, bk. 1, VIII, 8, 9, 10; IX, 30; X, 10.

[4] *In Ezech.*, bk. II, 8-10. Cf. *Moral.*, VI, 61.

[5] *Moral.*, V, 66. — [6] *Moral.*, V, 9. — [7] *Moral.*, XXX, 53.

[8] *Moral.*, V, 50. — [9] *Moral.*, V, 51. — [10] *Moral.*, XXII, 51.

[11] Resplendente raptim coruscatione incircumscripti luminis illustratur. Veritatem sentiendo, videt quia quanta est, ipsa veritas non est. Cui veritati tanto magis se longe existimat, quanto magis appropinquat, quia *nisi illam utcumque conspiceret,* nequaquam eam conspicere se non posse sentiret. *Moral.*, XXIV, 11; XXXI, 100 sq.

[13] *Moral.*, V, 50, 51.

[*3] Neither after the experimental historic method of St. Theresa, whose testimony is thereby strengthened, nor according to the theoretical method of theologians.

[*4] *Moral.*, V, 66; X, 13.

[*5] *Moral.*, XXIV, 11. See above note 11.

[*6] *Moral.*, XXXI, 101.

as they live here below the saints see the mysteries *of* the Divine Nature only in some image*". St. Gregory also compares it to a word, or rather, because it is so indistinct, either to a breath sometimes faint sometimes violent[2], or a murmer (susurrium)[3] in order to indicate how "God insinuates Himself secretly in us, how He reaches the ear of the spirit"[4]. True contemplation is found only in heaven ; in this world there is but the prelude *{sola initia)**. Further, the grace of contemplation is in itself very short, and sometimes lasts only for a moment[6].*

The last remarks regarding the rapidity of this prayer, prove that Gregory was obviously referring, not to a state, the contemplative life in general, but to its specific element, an essentially supernatural and infused grace. And that, too, shows why he so strongly stressed its powerful effects : a deep *humility,* since the knowledge of God gives rise to a true knowledge of self; [7] *compunction,* severing the soul from things temporal to throw it into the arms of God[8];* unshakable *peace* [9] and heavenly *joys; [10]* a renewed and especially burning love in the *search for God :* " for we are carried on to higher things when we are touched by the breath of the Spirit"; and with the "love of our heavenly home" that Ide enkindles, "traces of the Godhead, are, as it were, imprinted in the heart that receives it "[11].

This " love of our heavenly home " kindled in the soul by contemplation gives to the *preacher[s* words an almost lightning efficacy[12], more especially, as we saw above, since his intellect shares more deeply through the gift of wisdom, in the divine light. Thus, though brief, contemplation is prolonged in its effects, and the activities of the saints, already profiting from graces received, also remain *indeficienter,* a part of their quest of God[13]. The active life here merges itself in the contemplative. In theory, no Christian, no matter his condition, is excluded from contemplation[14], even though in practice few receive

[1] Sancti omnes, quamdiu in hac vita sunt, naturæ divinæ secreta quasi sub quadam imaginatione conspiciunt. *Moral.,* χχϊπ, 39· These expressions echo from afar those oí St. John of the Cross: *nocturnavisio; sub incerta imaginatione caligamus; ad videndum Dominum quadam premi caligine.*

[2] *Moral.,* v, 65.

[3] *Moral.,* v, 51. In n. 52 the same comparison is explained in the sense of the creature's quest for God (contemplative meditation), rather than contemplation in the true sense.

[4] *Moral.,* V, 51. — [5] *In Ezech.,* 11, bk. 8.

[6] God is seen *quasi furtim* and *per transitum. In Ezech.,* bk. I, V, 12. Sec *Moralia,* V, 58 *(raptim videmus).* Cf. *ibid.,* VIH, 49 ; χχχ. c? · χχχιπ. 41. [7] *hi Ezech..* i, vili. 17. — [8] *Moral.,* xxm, 40-43.

[9] *Moral..* XXII. 36-3S. This deep peace does not exclude all trials, even interior ones. — [10] *Moral.,* xxxi, 101-102. Cf. *ibid.,* χχιν 11-12.

[11] *Moral.,* X. 13. — [13] *In Ezech.,* bk. I, V, 13.

[*3] *Moral.,* X, 31. — u *hi Ezech.,* bk. n, vi, 19.

the grace ', and though many, in view of their dispositions cannot prudently apply themselves to it

D) Pastoral teaching* 3.

St. Gregory's mystical doctrine leads naturally to his pastoral teaching. He desires that every true preacher should bea contemplative, and that the contemplative pursue the active life, not only by the practice of the virtues in general, but also by *pastoral activity* in cases when he is called to it and possesses the necessary qualifications. In the first book of the Pastoral there is a severe chapter 4 against those who resist this appeal : " Several, though endowed with noble talents, evince a taste only for the contemplative life, refuse to serve their neighbour by announcing to him the truth, love retirement and bury themselves in solitude. Should their conduct he regarded strictly, it will certainly be found to be all the more reprehensible inasmuch as the good they could have done would have been so much greater" 5. For some at least, therefore, pastoral action is part of that full active life that God expects of the perfect.

St. Gregory gave the rules of pastoral action with more profusion than any other of the early Doctors. He speaks of it incessantly in the *M'oralia,* in his correspondence, and even in his homilies; in his *Pastoral* he treats it ex professo. Nevertheless, even here it should be remarked that it is in the nature of moral and spiritual guidance rather then a theoretical treatment or a technical introduction. As Hedley says, he neither descends to casuistry or enters into practical details; this manual is in reality " a vast outpouring of ideas, entrusted to the reader's intelligence, so that he may develop them and turn them to his advantage " 6*

St. Gregory dwells more particularly on the moral requirements of the priesthood. *Learning* of course is essential ; for the guidance of souls is an art, the foremost of the arts, and to take on such a responsibility without corresponding aptitudes would be rash in the extreme, as Gregory declares at the beginning of the Pastoral'. He then passes on to an exclusive consideration of the virtues that should grace the soul of the priest8. The greater part of book I is devoted to them : he condemns those who refuse the priesthood through pusillanimity9 and not through humility10; he is still more severe on

1 *Moral.,* V, 20. — 3 *Moral.,* vi, 57. See above, p. 243, n. 4.
3 See J. C. Hedley, mentioned above, p. 246. — 4 *Past.,* 1, 5.
5 *Ibid.* — 6 *0/>. oil.,* p. 18-19.
7 Nulla ars doceri præsumitur, nisi intenta prius meditatione discatur. Ab imperitis ergo pastorale magisterium qua temeritate suscipitur, quando *ars est artium regimen animarum. Past.,* I, 1.
8 *Past.* I, 2-4. — 9 *Ibid.,* 5. — ,0 *Ibid.,* 6.

those who seek it, not through zeal but ambitiously with selfish motives'. This personal holiness of the priest, so well described at the end of the first book of the Pastoral3, is again frequently recommended in bookII4;* where the interior life3 is specially mentioned as a means of preserving and strengthening it. Here, however, he is particularly intent on defining the conduct of the priest in his *relations with souls.* Saint Gregory advises circumspection both in the priest's silences and in his words6, affability towards the good, and firmness with those who need correction ; to these virtues must be added great modesty7. He desires that the priest, without seeking popularity, should at least make himself loved by his people so as to draw them more surely in the way of truth8; lastly he teaches the priest how to admonish, sometimes kindly sometimes severely, but always with wisdom and discretion9.

Of all the duties of the priest, preaching· seems to have interested St. Gregory the most. To this subject he devoted all the *third book* of the Pastoral, which comprises two thirds of the whole work. All his counsels however may be reduced to one *single rule; to adapt oneself* to the circumstances and character of one's listeners, so as to draw them all to Jesus Christ by the means most fitted to each one of them Io. He goes on to apply this principle to various classes of persons, grouping them, two by two, in 40 chapters : " Men must be exhorted in one way, women in another; young persons in one way, children in another... etc...". Having finished with the *conditions* of people he comes to their *characters :* the taciturn, the gossips, the lazy, the restless, etc...; and then *sinners,* of whom he writes at length ". St. Gregory's method is obviously quite different from St. Augustine's in the *De Doctrina Christiana.* He was above all a moralist and a psychologist; sometimes he reveals a charming penetration, but too often deals in generalities I2. At any rate, the rules of sacred oratory are scarcely taught in the Pastoral. The blessed Doctor treats of the latter, however, at great length in the *Moralia,* especially in books XXX and XXXI. There again he stresses vividly the moral conditions that are necessary for the ministry of the word. Before all, he recommends prayer and *contemplation.* This latter condition,

' *Ibid.,* 7. — ' *Ibid.,* 8-9. — 3 *Ibid.,* io-ll. — 4 *Past.,* n, 1-2.

3 Sit rector præ cunctis contemplatione suspensus. *Ibid.,* 5 and 7, π.

6 Sit rector discretus in silentio, utilis in verbo, ne aut tacenda proferat, aut proferenda reticescat. *Ibid.,* ⅄.

î *Ibid.,* 6. In this chapter are vigorous remarks on the folly of pride.

8 *Ibid.,* 8. — 9 *Ibid.,* 9-10. — to *Past,* ill, Prologue.

" On penance, see above p. 244, sq.

« See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 87.

so often touched upon, proves once again from what depths of interior life sprang the activity of this great pope, true leader and eminent moralist.

CHAPTER II.

Spanish writers.

Saint Isidore.

Special Bibliography : see the notes for each author.

On the chapter as a whole, Hurter, *Nomenclator,* t. I. For the historical part, H. Leclercq, *L' Espagne chrétienne,* Paris, 1906 (general bibliography, p. 17-24). Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist, des conciles,* t. in, 175 sq.

I. BEFORE ST. ISIDORE. ST. MARTIN. ST. LEANDER.

A) Saint Martin of Brag-a, apostle of the Suevi.

At the beginning of the \zth century about 409, the Barbarians found their way into Spain. The vanguard of this army was formed by the Vandals, the Suevi, the Alaini, whose numbers were soon swelled by the Bagaudæ, the Heruli and especially the Visigoths. The newcomers founded settlements by force of arms, in various provinces, and soon took to fighting among themselves. After 428 the Vandals were attracted to Africa and gave up their claims. Several of the emigrant bands were absorbed by others. At the end of the Vth century there remained but two considerable rivals; the *Suevi,* firmly entrenched in Galicia and Lusitania, and the *Visigoths,* masters of the rest of the Peninsula, with Toledo as their centre. Between the years 467 and 476 *Euric* (467-485) brought nearly the whole of Spain under the sway of the Gothic kingdom of Toulouse. Hard pressed by the Franks, the Goths crossed the Pyrenees in great numbers at the beginning of the VIth century, and a little later, under Leovigild they conquered Galicia and destroyed the kingdom of the Suevi (585), thus obtaining undisputed sway in the Peninsula. Their conversion to Catholicism, at this period, marked the opening of a period of relative prosperity both for the Church and for Spain. The Suevi, however, were Catholics before them.

The *Suevi* had already been Catholics but were *drawn into Arianism* about 466 by their king who had been perverted by an apostate. They did not return to the true faith until a century later, in 566, when they were converted by Saint

Martin of Dumio or Bragar. A Pannonian by birth, he became Bishop of lours. History tells us nothing of the reasons that brought him to Galicia, where he was first an abbot, then Bishop of Dumio (at least after 563) and finally Archbishop of Braga in 572. According to Gregory of fours, Martin was one of the most learned men of his time. The moral influence this reputation earned for him, no doubt helped in the conversion of Mir, the king of the Suevi, which was soon followed by that of the whole nation. Saint Martin is also known for having presided over several *synods*[1] notably at *Braga* (1st), 563, against the Priscillianists[3]: the 17 canons of this council were the deathstroke of the heresy; also at *Lugo (Sóg);* at *Braga* (2nd), 572, when a stand had to be made against the greed of the new Catholic clergy. Saint Martin died probably in 580.

Saint Martin's literary achievement[4] contains no very ambitious work, but is made interesting by the number as well as the practical nature of the opuscula he composed. The author was chiefly a moralist, a spiritual director of the laity and the monks. He also wrote various works on canonical subjects.

a) The following opuscula were intended for the laity (the first is dedicated to the young king of the Suevi, Miro): *Formula vita honesta*[5], excellent treatise of natural ethics, reduced to the four cardinal virtues of prudence, magnanimity, continence, justice; *Pro repellenda jactantia, De superbia, Exhortatio humilitatis*[6]; all three praising humility and condemning pride; *De ira*[7],* a fine treatise based on Seneca.

b) For the monks were composed the two collections of ascetic maxims, copied from the Oriental lauras: *Sententice cegyptorum Patrum*[*,*]*. little anonymous compilation translated by Martin; *Verba seniorum'*, another collection translated on Martin's authority by Paschasius his disciple.

c) Saint Martin's canonical work completes his moral writings. In addition to the canons of the 1st council of Braga (563),[0], which owe

1 E. Amman, *Martin de Braça (Saint),* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 203-207

9 See Heeele-Leclercq, *Hist, cone.,* tn, 174-197.

3 See vol. 1, p. 606-607.

4 There is not yet a complete edition of his works. That in *P. L.,* 72, contains many defects.

5 7'. *L.,* 72, 21-2S. — 6 *P. L,, ibid.,* 31-36; 35-38; 39-42.

' *L., ibid.,* 41-50 (in 9 chapters). The authenticity of a *Libellas de moribus* (*L.* 72, 29-32) is doubtful, and more dubious still the *De paupertate,* published mistakenly under the name of Seneca (ed. Fr. Haase hi d aqS-475>- —6 Λ 74» 381-394. — 9 *V0 D.* 83, 1025-1065.

10 Mansi, *Cone.,* xi, 853-841.

their inspiration to him, he was responsible tor a little collection ofconciliary canons, chiefly Oriental, entitled *Capitula Martini';* they are divided into two parts : duties of ecclesiastics, duties of laymen. To these disciplinary writings may be added the letter *De trina incisione,* in which baptism by a single immersion[1]* is judged to be Sabellian, and the opusculum *De Pascha*\ which explains the rules of the Paschal computation.

We must also mention a homily entitled *De correctione rusticorum* \ combating the traces of Paganism still remaining in country places, and three poems[5], one of which is the author's own epitaph "These few verses bear witness, that in Barbarian countries, Martin of Braga, still retained a feeling for the ancient culture. Last survivor of a vanishing civilisation, he is at the same time a herald of the new ages, and precisely in this lies the attraction of the converter of the Suevi[6]*

B) Saint Leander, apostle of the Visigoths [7].

During the greater part of the vith century the *Visigoths* constituted themselves fanatical protagonists of *Arianism. Leovigild* (d. 586) who was able to set up his empire after several victories over the Byzantines and the Suevi, persecuted the Catholics relentlessly. It was nevertheless during his reign that a movement towards conversion began, due especially to Saint Leander, Archbishop of Seville.

Leander was a native of Carthagena. At the time of the Gothic invasion in 549 h>s family removed to Seville. There is little likelihood that he was connected with the royal family. Two of his brothers were also bishops ; St. Isidore at Seville and St. Fulgentius at Carthagena; his sister, Fiorentina, was a religious. Leander himself had been a monk, and during that period of his life he came into contact with *Hcnnenigild,* the son of Leovigild. This prince, persuaded by his Catholic wife, had leanings to Catholicism. Leander instructed him and brought him into the Church. The neophyte immediately became the champion of his fellow Catholics and allied himself with the Byzantines in order to put an end to the persecution. This move, which has been too severely criticised by some[8], was approved by Leander, who, about 581, himself went to Constantinople to seek the emperor's support. Hermcnigild held out against l is father for two years at Seville, but the town was taken at last. Leovigild degraded his son, exiled him to Valencia and possibly even had him executed (585).

• *Ibid.,* 845-860. *P. L.,* 84, 574-586; 130, 575-58S.

2 J. Tixeront, *op. cit.,* in, p. 371.

372, 49-52.

* Very erudite edition by C. P. Caspar 1, Christiania, 1883.

s *P. L.,* 72, 51-52.

6 E. Amman, *op. at.,* col. 207.

? E. Amman, *Ltandre de Séville,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 96-9S.

8 One must take into account not only Leovigild's persecution of the Catholics, but also the mentality of the vith century, when an appeal to the emperor was not looked upon as treason. See also II. LECLERCQ, *op. at.,* p. 257-258.

Leander had become Archbishop of Seville in the preceding year. The death of Leovigild in 586 brought the persecution to an end. His second son, *Recared* (586-601) completed the conversion of the Visigoths. It is not easy to determine the part played by Leander in this happy event; he was certainly one of the first prelates of the kingdom. At any rate, he gave great prominence and solemnity to this return to the faith, in the Hird Council of Toledo (589) and thus helped to quicken the flow of conversions L During his whole lifetime Leander remained the king's friend and counsellor and always influenced him favourably. They both died probably in the same year (601). Leander was reputed a true statesman and a great bishop.

Several of his writings mentioned by St. Isidore[2] are lost. There remain extant an *homily* (on the triumph of the Church in converting the Goths)[3] and an opusculum to his sister Florentina (2λτ *institutione virginum et contemptu mundi)*[4] a veritable rule for religious, written in agreeable and familiar style, both firm and affectionate in tone, as became its author[5].

St. Leander's most important achievement and his great glory was the inauguration, in the Council of Toledo, 589, of the new religious policy that was to be increasingly developed throughout the Vllth century in the long series of councils held in that town. *18 councils of Toledo* are known to have been held before 701, but the first, known especially for its 20 canons, goes back to the year 400[6].* The second (527) caused little stir[7]. It was really the Hird (589) which opened the series[8] of these mixed gatherings, in which princes and lords sat side by side with the bishops, and in which, as even the Protestant Guizot admits, the

1 Even did Leander not preside at the Council (he signed third in the conciliary acts) he was certainly the prime mover, thanks to his influence over the prince.

3 *De viris ill.,* 41, *P. L.,* 83, 1103-1104. Isidore mentions two short polemical writings against the Arians.

3 Oration made at the end of the council of 589.

4 Also termed *Rule : P. L.,* 72, 873-894.

5 His letters are lost, and we are uncertain of the extent of his liturgical works, though he seems to have busied himself considerably in this field.

6 Hkfele-Lf.CLECQ, *Hist, cone.,* II, p. 122 sq.

' *Ibid.,* p. 1080 sq.

- These councils were held in the following years : 589, 633, 636, 638, 646, 653, 655, 656, 675, 6S1, 683, 684. 688, 693, 694, 701. See Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist, cone.,* t. III.

Church took first place. The Visigoth legislative was at this time thoroughly imbued with Christianity ; this is shewn either by general ideas totally alien to the Barbarians (i. e., equality of men before the law) or by particular prescriptions (such as the gradual abolition of slavery), etc. The *Forum judicum* (collection of laws) which was a mixture of law, learning and sermons, says H. Leclercq, was translated into Castilian in the Ninth century by St. Ferdinand, under the title of *Fuero Juzgo,* and long remained the basis of Canon Law. It has been found possible to reproach *this ancient Visigothic legislation* with uniting too closely the Church and the State, to the point of confusing them. But in spite of the bishops' efforts it was far from being applied as a whole and did not prevent the decline of the nation. The latter cannot be laid to the charge of the councils, which achieved great things, especially the *ecclesiastical laws.* The latter firmly and nobly proclaimed the need of submitting to Catholic dogma, and aimed at restoring the purest evangelical morality among all Christians; bishops, priests, and laity L The last council was held in 701. Ten years later (711) the Arabs entered Spain.

C) Secondary authors.

1. **Idaeus**, a Galician by birth, consecrated Bishop of Cava in 427, completed a *Chronicle*[1] after 470. This work covers the years between 379 and 470. The author, continuing St. Jerome's work, used only early documents in the first part of the work, but for the years after 427, also speaks as an eye-witness ; hence the interest of his narration as regards the History of Spain and especially Galicia.

2. **John of Biclaro** (Vlth cent.), abbot of Biclaro and bishop in 591, continued the *Chronicle of* Victor of Tunnunum[3] from 568 to 590. This chronicle was later carried forward by St. Isidore.

3. **Justinian** (d. after 546), Bishop of Valencia, was the author of a dogmatic writing *(Answers to Rusticus)* possibly preserved in St. Ildephonse' s *De cognitione baptismi*[4].

4. **Justus**, Bishop of Urgel, Justinian's brother, composed a commentary on the *Canticle of Canticles*[5] an allegorical explanation of outstanding clarity and concision.

5. Apringius, Bishop of Badajoz, wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse about the year 540[6].

1 See H. Leclercq, *op. cit.,* 28759., 329 sq.
2 *P. L.,* 51, 873-890; 74, 701-750. *Mon. Germ. Hist.* (Mommsen's ed), 1894 (vol. Xi). — 3 Λ *L.,* 72, 869-870. *Mon. germ. hist., ibid.*
4 See below, p. 267. —5 *P. L.,* 67, 961-994.
6 Edited by D. FÉROTIN, Paris, 1900.

6. Severus of Malaga, wrote against the Arians and on virginity *(The Ring) :* none of his works is extant.

II. SAINT ISIDORE OF SEVILLE (d. 636) \

A) Life.

Saint Isidore was born about 560, probably at Seville. His father died soon after his birth and he was brought up by his brother and his sister Fiorentina, both much older than Isidore and his other brother Fulgentius, the future Archbishop of Carthagena. He received a sound education in the monasteries of Seville and afterwards entered the religious life there. At last, about 600, he succeeded his brother as Archbishop of Seville. For thirty-six years he was one of the most important persons in Spain, and presided over synods, not only in his own province of *Bctica* (synods of Seville in 619 and 625 especially) but also in neighbouring provinces. Thus, in 610, his was the first signature on the royal decree, approved by a synod held at the court, which transferred to Toledo the metropolitan dignity which till then had been given to Carthagena. It was at the fourth national council of Toledo (633), however, that Isidore as president exercised the most authority.

The IVth Council of Toledo is the most famous of Spanish councils 2 The important decisions of this gathering deal with four principal subjects, religious, social and political.

a) From a *religious viewpoint,* the council, after promulgation of a creed, imposed liturgical uniformity on the whole country (c. 2), settled various disciplinary matters (7-19), stressed the obligation of celibacy for priests (21-27) reminded bishops of their duty of superintending civil judges and denouncing infractions of power (32), and lastly

1 Editions : *P. L.,* 81-84 (Arevalo's ed. Rome, 1797-1803, the best iodate), partial editions : see below. Studies : F. Arevalo, *Prolegomena* to the works, in *P. L.,* 81, 9*568. Bourret, *12 école chrétienne de Séville,* Paris, 1855, ρ· 59*x93- Valenti, S. *Isidoro, noticia de su vida y escritos,* Valladolid, 1909. C. H. Benson, *Isidor-Studien,* Munich, 1913. M. Menendez y pelayo, *S. Isidore et son rôle dans Γhist, intell, de l'Esp.,* in *Annales de philos, chrét.,* 1SS2 (vol. vil), p. 258-269. G. Bareille, *Isidore de Séville (saint),* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 98-111. J.Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, 33259. Dom. P. Séjourné, S *Isidoie de Seville, son rôle dans Γhistoire du droit canonique,* Paris, 1929.

1 II. Leclercq. *12Espagne chrétienne.* Paris, 1906, p. 302-310.

declared clerks free of taxes and villainage (47). *b) Touching the Jews,* the council, while blaming the measures of king Sisebut who had forced them to become Catholics, maintained the decisions of the Hird council C589), forbade them to hold positions in which the}7 could punish Christians and did not allow them to possess Christian slaves. In addition, apostate convert Jews were to have their possessions confiscated, *c) With regard to the State* the council recognised the new king Sisenand, who had just dethroned Suinthila, and threatened excommunication to all who should attack him (c. 75). By this measure the Church endeavoured to forestall fresh troubles and at the same time affirmed the political views of the clergy and strengthened the union of Church and State, *d) With regard to education* the council decided to found a college in each diocese for training the clergy (c. 24).

The latter move has been rightly ascribed to Saint Isidore whom already Braulio was calling the restorer of studies in Spain in the Vllth century. He had already founded a great college in Seville where future priests were prepared for their ministry under the guidance of a superior who was both a *magister doctrina* and a *testis vita.* Here, Saint Ildephonsus was trained. Learning is indebted to Isidore to an even greater extent by reason of his *innumerable works* which bear witness to his vast erudition, and capacity for work, equalled only by his zeal for the good of the Church and his desire to serve his flock by snatching it from the darkness of barbarianism. He died in April 636 having shown during the last months of his life, extraordinary tokens of unselfishness and charity. He was declared *Doctor (Doctor egregius, Ecclesia catholica novissimum decus)* by the X^IIIth council of Toledo (653), honoured as such by the Church of Seville, and finally by the universal Church from the time of Innocent XIII (1722).

B) Works of St. Isidore.

St. Isidore's works are extremely numerous. They may be grouped under four heads : *Encyclopedic, scientific and historical, scriptural,* and *theological and moral* works. His *correspondence*[1] need only be mentioned in passing. It comprises but 12 letters, of which 3 were received by

[1] *P. I..,* 83, 893-914. And some dedicatory letters prefacing his works.

Isidore. Many other works, chiefly *canonical* and liturgical, have been attributed to him [x]. Their authenticity however is by no means sure.

a) Encyclopaedic works. Two works, especially, resemble encyclopaedias and well illustrate Isidore's method. To them may be added an interesting opusculum.

1. The Etymologies sometimes called the *Origins,* form St. Isidore's most important work. They were never completed. It is uncertain whether the division of the work into 20 books is due to Isidore or whether it was not perhaps the work of Braulio, Archbishop of Saragossa, who published the manuscripts sent to him by the author. In these books Isidore treats successively of: *a)* bk. 1-4: the *liberal arts,* subject of the trivium, 1-2, and of the quadrivium, 3, and also *of* medicine, 4; *b)* bk. 5-8: *offast ages* (summary of universal history) 5, and especially of the chief *religious sciences:* liturgy, 6; theology 7; Churches and sects, 8; *c)* bk. 9-12: on *living things:* mankind and its division by countries, languages, 9; on words, 10; the nature of man, 11; on animals, 12; *d)* bk. 13-16: on *inanimate beings:* cosmology, 13; geography, 14-15; metals, 16; *e)* lastly, books 17-20: on *some arts practised* by man: agriculture 17; war, 18; building and clothing, 19; cooking and various utensils, 20. Isidore builds up his ideas by reference to etymologies and when unable to find a natural one seeks others that are more or less far-fetched; some are grotesque *{nox* from *nocere, amicus* from *hamüs),* sometimes ridiculous; others are very remarkable. In such a work it would be gratifying to find a more judicious choice; nevertheless, such as it is, it was found of great service in the Middle Ages.

2. The Differentiae[3] or De proprietate sermonum, again treats, with slight differences, various subjects dealt with in the Etymologies, by comparing words. Book 1 *{De differentiis verborum)* establishes 610, differences of meaning concerning all kinds of subjects including philosophy. Book II *{De differentiis rerum* J is a veritable little *theological treatise* based on the same method. It contains 170 paragraphs and its chief subjects are: the Trinity, Christ (power and nature), paradise, angels, men, freewill, the fall, grace, the law and the Gospel, the active and the contemplative life, learning and wisdom etc.

3. The De ordine creaturarum[4] treats of *a)* God; *b)* angels (9 choirs) and devils; *c)* the world (firmament, stars, earth, paradise); *d)* man after the fall, sin and its punishment (hell and purgatory), and finally, future life.

b) Scientific and historical works.

I. The De natura rerum[5] is a little treatise on physics and cosmography, dedicated to King Sisebut (612-621).

[1] *P. L.,* 84, the whole volume.

[2] *P. L.,* 82, 73-728. Recent edits.: Beer, Leyden, 1909; W. M. Lindsay, Oxford, 1911. — [3] *P. L.,* 83, 9-98.

[4] £., 83, 913-954. The Spanish editor, Arevalo, also retains this work as authentic.

[5] *P. L.,* 83, 963-1018. Ed. G. Becker, Berlin, 1857. Cf. Schf.nk, *De nat. return fontibui* (diss.), lena 1909.

2.The Chronicon.[1] (summarised in bk. v of the Etymologies) describes in 122 paragraphs the six ages of the world, from the creation to the year 616. The author's chief sources were Julius Africanus, Eusebius, St. Jerome, \zictor of Tunnunum. Isidore recounts with some detail the conversion of the Visigoths and the part played therein by Leander his brother.

3. The Historia de regibus Gothorum, Wandalorum et Suevorum[2] consists of a compilation of divers documents; the first part concerning the Goths is the longest and most valuable.

4.The De Viris illustribus[3] is a continuation of St. Jerome[4] and Gennadius[5]. In its present state it contains 45 chapters, but the authenticity of the first twelve is not sure; the critics believe them to be by another (Vth cent.) author. The last 34 chapters date from 616-618 and are certainly by St. Isidore[6].*

ή Scriptural works: these are hardly exegetical works but rather studies on special points.

They may be classed in four series.

1.Short introductions *(prooemia)*[7] to various books of the Old and New Testaments.

2.Biographical accounts[8]* of various Biblical personages; 64 from the Old and 22 from the New Testament. There have been interpolations. (Duchesne thinks the passage on St. James containing at least two mistakes, was interpolated, since the canonical Epistle of James is attributed to James the Greater, and his death to Herod the Tetrarch or Antipas, instead of Herod Agrippa, King of Palestine from 41 to 44)'.

3.Various spiritual or *allegorical* explanations. These are at times exaggerated. In this class may be mentioned: the *allegories* 129 explaining the names and characters of Old Testament figures, 121 concerning the parables and miracles of Christ in the Gospels; *Questions on the Old Testament*", concerning biblical stories that foreshadow the future; the *Book of Numbers*[12] explains according to S. Augustine the biblical numbers, from 1 to 16, ιδ-^ο, 26, 30, 40, 46, 50, 6ο and finally 153 which ecjuals the sum of the 17 former numbers.

4. The Quaestiones de Veteri et Novo Testamento'[13] is a little opusculum rich in doctrine, which by comparing the two Testaments, shows the characteristic teaching of each.

[1] *P. L.*, 83, 1017-1058. Cf. Dressel, Turin, 1874.
[2] *L.*, 83, 1057-1082. *Mon. germ, hist.*, Berlin, 1894 (vol. xi), 304-390.
[3] *P. L.*, 83, 1081-1106. — [4] See vol. I, p. 586. — [5] See above p. 225.
[6] The work was continued by St. Ildephonsus. See below, p. 267.
[7] *In libros Veteris ac Novi Testamentiprocemia. P. L.*, 83, 155-180.
[8]* *De ortu et habitu patrum, P. L.*, 83, 129-156.
[9] L. Duchesne, *S. Jacques de Galice,* in *Annales du Midi,* 1890(70!. xii), p. 156-157. — [10] *Allegoria quadam sacra: scriptura P. L.*. 83, 99'130.
[11] *Quastiones in Vetus Testamentum,* or *Mysticorum expositiones sacramentorum. P. L.*, 83, 207-424. The author treats in turn nearly all the historical books of the O. T.
[12] *Liber numerorum qui in sanctis scripturis occurrunt. P. L.* 83, 179-200.
[13] *P. L.* 83, 201-208. In these few pages the author replies to 41 questions.

d) Theological and moral works. The three works mentioned above contain *a* good deal of theology. The *following* are more specialised writings on the same subjects.

1. De fide catholica contra Judaeos[1] is not a contro-\eisial \ ork so much as a do^maltc explanation concerning Christ (bk. I) and the effects of the Incarnation (bk. n).

2. 3 books of Sententiae[2] (nearly all drawn from St. Augustine and St. Gregory) form a veritable dogmatic, moral and ascetic manual. It is one of Isidore's most useful works and a favourite in the Middle Ages.

3. De ecclesiasticis officiis[3] dedicated to St. Fulgentius (d. 620) treats of divine worship in book I and of ecclesiastical offices in book II. It is valuable both from a liturgical and disciplinary point of view.

4.The Synonyma[4], better entitled *De lamentatione anima peccatricis* is a a kind of dialogue between man, crushed with life's miseries, and his reason, which urges him to hope, and discovers to him the way of perfection. It is Isidore's most interesting work of spiritual direction.

5. The monastic rules is, as the author admits, no more than a summary of the traditions of the early monks and later writings on the subject. Isidore must have been acquainted with the Benedictine rule.

C) Saint Isidore's doctrine.

Since the XVIIIth century[6], St. Isidore has been honoured as a Doctor by the universal Church. And rightly so, for even outside Spain his intellectual influence was outstandingly predominant in the Middle Ages. It is important however to underline its exact nature. St. Isidore's genius was not personal, original and creative as was St. Augustine's. He sifted very little to the bottom, yet he treated of everything. We might say that the wide field of his studies was indeed due to their very nature. S. Isidore was a *compiler* and an *erudite.* All his learning came from the past; he added nothing. He borrowed his theological and ascetic doctrine from St. Augustine and St. Gregory, just as he drew so largely on the treasures

[1] *p. L.,* 83, 449-538. — [2] *P. L.,* 83, 537-738.
[3] *P. L.,* 83, 737-826. [4] *P. L.,* 83, 825-856.
[5] *P. L.,* 83, 867-894. — [6] See above, p. 259.

of ancient literature. He was, moreover, extraordinarily gifted as a compiler and possibly there has never been a greater. Together with quick understanding and unfailing memory he possessed a great facility for clear and rapid explanation. And in spite of the fact that he used a language corrupted by an enormous incidence of foreign words, he was often able to give astonishingly exact definitions. Saint Isidore was providentially designed for his age and the following centuries. With Cassiodorus, Boethius and St. Gregory he was an *educator of the Middle Ages*[1]. His encyclopaedic knowledge won him especial fame at this period.

It is useless and perhaps impossible to give any methodical account of St. Isidore's doctrine; his works contain too much and too little. He was a faithful echo of tradition and summarised all the learning of his time. From this point of view his writings are extremely precious; but it would be impossible to extract from them the guiding ideas which are nowhere set out methodically in this vast encyclopaedia of human learning, nor in any more specialised work. Nevertheless we will endeavour to class various useful data concerning his *dogmatic* and *moral* teaching. These will be found useful both for a better understanding of the blessed Doctor's ideas (which have at times been misinterpreted) and also as a guide to the state of tradition at this period with regard to matters of importance, and subjects that are little known from other sources.

I. Dogmatic theology, may, even at the present time, find much that is to the point in five of Isidore's works: books 7 and 8 of the *Etymologice;* the greater part of book II of the *Differentia,* which treats of the "realities"; nearly the whole of the opusculum on the *Order of Created Beings;* the treatise *De fide* against the Jews and the whole of the first book of *Sententice.*

i. As regards the *spirituality* of the angels[2] and their division into nine choirs[3], Isidore follows St. Gregory who in his turn drew his inspiration from Dionysius the Areopagite[4].

1 Cf. M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* 1909, 1, p. 144 sq.

2 *Elymol.,* VII, V, 2. *Dij}.,* it, XIV, 41. Here, however, devils are termed *corpore aerei: ibid.,* 42.

3 *Etym.,* vu, v, 4-24.

4 See alxive, p. 100.

2. Isidore also admits the *spirituality of* the soul[1]. He seems to affirm clearly enough that the soul is *created* at the moment it animates the human body[2]. He nevertheless avows that until that time no very definite solution had been given to the problem.

3. Isidore adopted the current Augustinian teaching on Original Sin, concupiscence and the powerlessness of man when deprived of grace[3]. As a result of original sin, unbaptised children "luunt in inferno poenas"[4][5] *Grace* is a 'gift of the Divine Mercy'[6].

4. With regard to the Redemption, Isidore develops the two traditional notions of penal substitution[6] and sacrifice[7]. He also touches on the theory of the abuse of power[8].

5. Isidore's idea of the sacraments is borrowed from St. Augustine[9].* It loses something in the process however, for Isidore makes a greater distinction between the sign and the grace. The latter was the essential element for Augustine, but is no more than the effect for Isidore[10]. Further, like St. Ambrose, he appears to make the effect depend in too great a measure on the sanctification of the sign, the water, for instance Similarly, he applies the word sacrament only to the three rites of Christian initiation, *Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist*

6. Isidore devoted a special study to Holy Orders in Book II *De ecclesiasticis officiis*[13][14] He describes all the orders of the Western hierarchy; these of course had already been listed long before[14]. He even describes the clerical tonsure; the head entirely shaved, save for a narrow band forming a crown[15]. The custom of re-ordaining clergy who had been ordained by heretics, which was already beginning to embarrass the West, does not seem to have been known to Isidore. He adhered to Augustine's unwavering teaching on this point[16].

7. St. Isidore's Eschatology is very orthodox. He clearly rejects the error of the *misericordes* by an explicit affirmation of the eternal fire

* *Difi.*, U, XXVII, 92. See above p. 179. — [2] *Sentent.*, I, xn, 4.
[3] *Differ.*, π, XXX, 109 sq., XXXII, H5sq.
[4] *Sentent.*, I, xxn, 2. See above, p. 198.
[5] *Differ.*, II, XXXII, 115.
[6] *Sentent.*, I, xiv, 4-13. — [7] *Defide*, I, XLIII.
[8] *Sentent.*, I, xiv, 12; III, v, 30-33. See J. Rivière, *op. cit.*, p. 280 and 447. — [9] See vol. 1, p. 605. — [10] *Elymol.* VI, xix, 41.
[11] *Ibid.*, 49. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogrn.*, in. p. 368. Cf. vol. 1, p. 546.
[12] *Ibid.*, 39. — [13] *De eccl. off.*, II, c. v-xv. Cf. *Etym.*, vn, xn, 3.
[14] Already found in the 3rd cent., in the famous letter of Pope Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch on the subject of Novatian. See vol. I, p. 251. Cf. J. Tixeront, *L'Ordre el les Ordinalions*, p. 87 sq.
[15] *De eccl. off.*, II, iv, 4. This is the present Franciscan tonsure and is termed the tonsure of St. Peter. At the period in question the monks had their heads entirely shaved; this was called St. Paul's tonsure and was also that of penitents except in Spain, where the beard and hair were allowed to grow, in order, says Isidore "ut demonstrent abundantiam criminum quibus caput peccatoris gravatur". *Ibid.*, xvn, 3. The Celtic clergy retained the hair on the nape of the neck and shaved the top and sides of the head; this was derisively called the tonsure of Simon Magus. Cf. J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 100-102.
[16] See vol. I, p. 70S.

of *hell'* prepared for those who die in mortal sin (capitalia crimina;. The " non principalia crimina quæ maculant, sed illa quæ non multum nocent", will be expiated in the fire of *Purgatory (ignis purgatorius) "*3. Such sins are distraction in prayer, impatience, gluttony, excesses in sleep and words, late rising, vain gossip, careless omissions, etc. 3. *Heaven* will consist essentially in the intuitive vision of God, the source of all happiness4.

8. The elect are freely predestined to Heaven5; but there exists also for the damned a "predestination" to death (suffering). God does not positively will the evil that leads to their loss6, but he has prepared the punishments their faults have deserved, since He has not called them to glory. Nevertheless this free choice of some together with reprobation of others7 is most mysterious and leads Isidore to write at the end of this short chapter : " Et in hac tanta obscuritate non valet homo divinam perscrutari dispositionem, et occultum prædestinationis perpendere ordinem

2. All the essentials of moral theology and traditional spirituality found their place in the vast theological encyclopedia of the Bishop of Seville. For these matters the Oilowing may be profitably consulted : the 2nd book of the *Differentia* for the foundations of moral theology, and the entire treatise *Synonyma* together with *Sententia,* books II and III, for the ascetic teaching. The special duties of clergy and monks are to be found in the *De ecclesiasticis officiis* and the *Rule.*

1. The distinction between grave and venial sins has been mentioned above in connection with hell and purgatory8.* There are eight *capital sins* (or vices); gluttony, fornication, avarice, envy, sadness, anger, vanity and lastly pride, the root of all evil 9. These vices are also fomented by concupiscence which is an effect of original sin Io.

2. The virtues11 12 13 are the antidote to vice. They are acquired only by means of a long, continual '2, and intense

I De ord. creat., XIII, i-io. See above, p. 244.
3 *Ibid.,* Xiv, 1-12. —3 *Ibid.,* π.
4 *Ibid.,* XV, 1-7. For his Eschatology as a whole see : *Sentent.,* I, xxv-xxx.
5 *Sentent.,* II, VI, 1-6.
6 Isidore says in a previous chapter *(Ibid.,* v, 13) that God does not positively harden sinners. —7 We no longer speak of predestination in this second sense.
8 Se also *Sent.* II, c. XVIH-XIX.
Differ., IL XL, 161-16S. This is St. Gregory's classification: see vol. I, p. 297. — 10 *Ibid.,* II, XXXI, 109 sq.
Il Sent., II, c. XXXVii-XLiv, on devils and their onslaughts, see *ibid.,* Ill, v, vi.
13 Sent., II, XXXVI, 1-4. Very perspicacious remarks. " A modicis virtutibus gradatiti! ad ea quæ sunt excelsa contendit (homo). Qui autem inordinate virtutes comprehendere nititur, cito periclitatur " (3-4).

struggle, with the help of grace. In this order the fundamental virtues are the four great moral virtues[1], and in a higher order, faith, hope, and charity, which strengthen the soul by uniting it to God[2]. All these virtues find their perfection in *wisdom*[3].

3. Isidore's teaching on the active and contemplative life is a summary of that of St. Augustine and St. Gregory[4]. The two lives are far from being equally perfect[5]. Some souls are at ease only in the active life, others only in contemplation[6]. The ideal, however, is found in a "middle" life[7], as exemplified in Christ who preached and healed during the day and prayed in the night. "Idcirco Dei servus, juxta imitationem Christi, nec actualem vitam amittit, et contemplativam vitam agit[8].

4. The eternal verities form the object of wisdom and thus distinguish it from *knowledge* which treats of temporal things and which guides the active life much more than it aids the contemplative. In this, knowledge is similar to prudence; yet because knowledge also must seek after God, it leads to wisdom[9]. Nevertheless, even wisdom has its limits in this world, and there is no real knowledge of God without the realisation that He cannot be known perfectly[10].

5. Isidore gives very wise counsel on prayer and study[11]. In particular he recommends the study of the Scriptures, to which grace affords a true understanding. He does not tolerate the reading of profane authors, especially poets[12] whose deleterious moral influence he fears. The century in which he wrote was not that of St. Basil or St. Augustine. Yet Saint Isidore himself was acquainted with many early writings and it was through them, as well as his religious learning, that he became one of the educators of the Middle Ages.

[1] *Differ.*, II, XXX1X, 154-158. — [3] *Sent.*, II, n, nr, iv.
[3] *Sent.*, II, i, 1-14.
[4] *Differ.*, II, XXXIV, 13O-I35.
[5] *Ibid.*, 131 : Activa incipit, contemplativa pervenit.
[6] *Ibid.*, 134.
[7] His media et de utrisque composita.
[8] *Ibid.*, 134-135. See also *Sent.*, III, XV, 1-12.
[9] *Sent.*, II, i, 1-14. — [,0] *Ibid.*, 5.
[11] *Ibid.*, III, c. vii-xv.
[12] *Ibid.*, c. Xin.

HI. OTHER SPANISH AUTHORS IN THE VIIth CENTURY.

We can give but short mention to St. Braulio Archbishop of Saragossa. He was the most eloquent orator of the century, a great book-lover and after St. Isidore, a counsellor of the kings.

In the last years of the seventh century there were many remarkable men in Toledo. Among these may be mentioned St. Eugenius[3], (d. 657), Archbishop and famous poet, and his contemporary St. TAJON[3] of Saragossa. Worthy of somewhat lengthier notice are the two archbishops of Toledo, *St. Ildephonsus* and *St. Julian.*

St. Ildephonsus[4], the nephew of St. Fulgentius, was born of Gothic parents in about 607. He was first brought up by his uncle and then entrusted to the care of St. Isidore. After having been a monk, and then abbot, of a monastery near Toledo, he finally succeeded his uncle in 657. He died in 669. Of his many writings, there are extant, in addition to two letters, only the four following : *a)* a defence of the *perpetual virginity of Mary*[5] against the blasphemies of Helvidius; a work that reveals the faith and tender piety of its author ; *b) De cognitione baptismi*[6] *:* a useful guide to the organisation of the catechumenate ; *c) De itinere deserti quo pergitur post baptismum*[7] ; this desert is the spiritual life, faith and works; *d}* lastly, in a little *De viris illustribus*[*] he continues St. Isidore's works with an account of 14 ecclesiastical writers, mostly Spanish, among whom he numbers St. Isidore and St. Eugenius.

Saint Julian[9,10] Archbishop of Toledo from 680 to 690 was of Jewish origin. He was very like St. Isidore in many ways but showed greater originality in his work. He, too, was a statesman and wrote extensively on many subjects ; theology, history, apologetics, music and poetry. His chief extant writing is a dogmatic and ascetic treatise, in dialogue form, on the Last Things : *Pronostican futuri sæculi*™. Shortly after Julian's death, Spain was conquered by the Arabs.

[*] *P. L.,* 80, 649-720. — [2] *P. L.,* 87, 358-418.

[3] *P'* A., 80, 727-992 (collection of Sententiæ drawn from St. Gregory).

[4] See G. Ba REILLE, in *Diet, thiol.,* col., 740-743.

[5] *P. L.,* 96, 53-110. — [6] *Ibid.,* 171-172.

[7] *Ibid.,* 171-192. — [8] *Ibid.,* 195-206.

[9] See J. Forget, *Julien de Tolède,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1940-1942.

[10] *P. L.,* 96, 453-524. We might also mention three apolegetical works, two Scriptural essays, A *History of the Rebellion of* Duke Paul against Wamba, king of the Goths (*P. L.,* 96, 525-808), and lastly a panegyric of St. Ildephonsus (*P. L., ibid.,* 43-44).

CHAPTER III.

The last writers in Gaul and Great Britain.

Special Bibliography: see the notes for each author.

I. SAINT GREGORY OF TOURS

The future Bishop of Tours, Georgius Florentius, better known as Gregory, was born at Clermont Ferrand to an old Christian Gallo-Roman family of the senatorial class. This family had already given several bishops to the Church. Among these were three of Gregory's uncles: St. Gregory of Langres (d. 540), St. Gall of Clermont and St. Nizier, of Lyons; all of whom interested themselves in the young Gregory's education. The latter was the best that could be obtained at the time, both from a literary and a religious point of view: his literary style, though far from classical, was that of the highest ranks of society. Falling seriously ill in 563 Gregory made a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Martin and returned cured. It was probably on this Occasion that he came to the notice of the people of Tours, who chose him for their bishop ten years later. Pie accepted this nomination with some reluctance. Until his death, (593 or 594, Nov. 17) he governed this church, then the religious centre of the country, with untiring solicitude for the spiritual and temporal interests of his flock. He is honoured as a saint by the Church.

Gregory was one of the most outstanding ot those bishops of whom it has been said that "they made France" (Gibbon), "as the bee makes its hive" £J· 4e Maistre). In the last period of the Roman domination in Gaul, says Hergenroether[3], the bishops already ruled[2]

[1] Editions: *P. L.*, 71 (ed. Ruinart, 1699). W. Arndt and Bk. Krusch, in *Mon. gemi, script. : merov.*, i, Hanover, 1S84-1885. Studies: A. DUPUY, *de S. Grég. de Tours,* Paris, 1854. A. Lec0Y DE LA MARCHE. *De ¡ autorité de S. Grég. de Tours,* Paris, 1861. G. Monod, *Etudes critiques sur i époque mérovingienne* (Biblioth. de l E. des Hautes Etudes, fase. 9), Paris, 1S72. M. Bonnet, *Le latin de Grég. de Tours,* Paris, 1S90. H. Leclercq, *Grégoire de Tours,* in *Diet. Arch.,* col. 1711-1713.

[2] *Hist. gén. de V Egl'.,* fr. trans., Belet, ir, p. 676.

the towns as heads of the municipal authority; they shared in the administration and allocated municipal offices. In the years that followed, they became the natural spokesmen of the Gallo-Roman population, of which, towards the end of the Vith century, they themselves were members. They were thus able to act as its representatives in treating with the conquerers, from whom they succeeded in obtaining, together with the maintenance of Roman law, the adaptation of the new civil legislation to ecclesiastical law. The latter was the work of innumerable councils, both political and religious, in which bishops, Frankish chieftains and Gallo-Roman nobles treated together of the interests of the Church and State. These gatherings lasted throughout the whole of the Vith and Vllth centuries. Their cessation, coinciding, after 683, with the entry of vast numbers of Franks into the ranks of the clergy (from the end of the Vith century many bishops were of Frankish origin) marked a period of religious decadence.

All this must be borne in mind, the better to appreciate Gregory's influence; an influence that was emphasised by the importance of his see and his relations with many of the Frankish kings? This was a time of almost uninterrupted crime and warfare, a result of the rivalry between the two provinces of Neustria and Austrasia, each subject to a bloody-minded and ambitious woman, Fredegunde (d. 597) and Brunehilde (d. 613). Gregory, nevertheless, was fortunate enough to avoid any major misfortune at Tours and even restored to the town something of its former prosperity. He was able when necessary to hold his own against *Chilperic* (d. 584) king of *Neustria,* to whom he was subject. When Chilperic was assassinated by his wife Fredegunde in 584, Tours was made subject to *Austrasia.* Gregory had been the friend of *Sigebert,* also slain by order of Fredegunde in 575. After 584 he became a close consellor of *Childebert II* (575-596). He was particularly successfull in maintaining peace between the latter and his uncle Guntram, king of Burgundy. His efforts gained him the respect of his diocese and the whole of Gaul. Guizot fe t justified in saying of him, that at his death he was " famous throughout western Christendom

Though so busily engaged in political activities Gregory nevertheless found time to be one of the most fertile writers of his period. He appeared very sensible of his literary shortcomings and made profuse excuses for his " rusticity " 2, his rude style (incultu effatu) in which genders and cases are confused. Some critics regard these protestations as no more than rhetorical conceits or affected modesty ; others incline to think that Gregory, having some acquaintance with the classics which he tried to imitate, was in consequence very conscious of his inferiority. His style reveals " a strange contrast between the usual oratorical forms and a fresh and naive originality " 3. It is this that3

'Guizot, *Histoire de la civilisation en France definis la chute de Γempire romain,* XVIIIe conf. — 2 *Glor. conf.,* prooemium. *Hist, Franc.,* X, xxxi.

3 M. Bonnet, *op. cit.,* p. 751 sq.

provides such attraction for the philologists, who find in his writings the first traces of the Romance languages that grew out *of* Latin. For us, the interest lies in the contents of his literary work. This possesses a twofold character : first, a very marked *religious purpose,* present even in apparently secular works such as the History of the Franks. Here, Gregory's intention was the edification of the laity; he dwells particularly on religious beliefs, traditions and affairs of the Church : every page shows the hand of the bishop. On the other hand, nearly all his works are of a *historical nature,* not excepting his religious writings. The majority relate the lives of holy people and the miracles they performed. Those among whom the author lived and for whom he wrote, were especially fond of such narratives.

Saint Gregory's hagiographical work is chiefly composed of a series of eight books, which first existed independently but which were afterwards formed into a sort of collection by the author, and entitled Books of Miracles :

a) a book (107 ch.) on the *çlory of the martyrs** (about 590) as seen in their miracles ;

b) a book (50 ch.) on the passion, the virtues and the glory of *St. Julian of Brioude*\ d. 304 (581-587);

c) a book (112 ch.) on *the glory of the confessors* [4] (507, revised after 590). It is full of miraculous happenings ;

d) four books (207 ch.) of the miracles of *St. Martin*,* written intermittently during Gregory's episcopate ;

e') a book (20 ch.) of *Lives of the Fathers*[6] (20 biographies). This is the best work of the collection.

To this long series[7] must be added a number of books that did not form part of the collection and have not been so carefully preserved : the *Book of Miracles of St. Andrew** is extant only in chapter titles and a few fragments : the book of *Miracles of St. Thomas*[9] also appears to be lost; the translation of the *History of the seven sleepers of Ephesus*[13] is still extant: Gregory heard this story through a Syrian who acted as interpreter.

Saint Gregory's religious historical writing is thus chiefly composed of miraculous events. Gregory was not a critic but simply a story teller. This is what lends charm to his work and in a certain measure makes its weakness. " No doubt his credulity often astounds us ; more than

* O. Bardenhewer, Pair., in, p. 198. —3 *P. L.,* 71, 705-800.
3 *P. L.,* 71, Soj-828. A martyr in Diocletian's persecution.
4 *P. L., pi,* 827-910. — 5 *Ibid.,* 913-1008. —6 */bid.,* 1009-1096.
7 Edited under the title : *Ltber miraculorum,* Fr. trans. II. BordiER, Paris, 1857-1865 (4 vol., *Soc. Hist. Prance).*
8 Ed. *Mon. gena, hist.,* p. 821-846. —5 Ed. Bonnet, Leipsic, 1883.
10 S»e *Anal, bolland.,* 1893 it. xn), p. 371*3^7« *P.* 71* 1105-1118.

one mistake, the consequence of a kind of laziness that made him somewhat despise the resources he possessed. Nevertheless, his perfect historical probity is generally recognised at the present time

Little remains of the rest of Gregory's religious writings.

a) The book he compiled from the *Misses* of Sidonius Apollinarius is lost. The exact nature of these ^*Misses ab eo composites*[1]3 is still unknown.

Mere fragments of a *Commentary of the Psalter* are extant \

c) The *De cursibus ecclesiasticis* or *De cursu stellarum ratio* 45(575-582), is an endeavour to show that the fervent Christian should regulate the time of his rising for prayer in the night, according to the rising of the more important constellations.

The History of the Franks5, Gregory's most important work, macle him really renowned as a writer. The work contains ten books, The first forms a kind of introduction. The second narrates the History of the Francs until Clovis (d. 511). The third and fourth books continue the history as far as 575, the date of Sigebert's death. The last six, covering the years from 575 to 591 6*are more in the nature of mémoires : the interminable accounts of an eye-witness, who, though impartial, well informed and possessing a certain critical judgment, does not spare the reader the slightest detail. The truth of the work as a whole is not impaired by the author's outbursts against the enemies of the Church 7. The weakness of the work lies in its total lack of historical composition; events are never linked up with reference to their causes and no attempt is made to throw general principles into relief. All the great value of the work is to be found in the vast number of facts that are related and the fresh and unspoilt nature of the narrative8.

1 O. Bardenhewer, *Pair.*, in, p. 198-199. His method was very similar to that of Sulpicius Severus in his life of St. Martin, (vol. I, p. 561) or St. Gregory's in the Dialogues (see above p. 241.)

2 *Hist. Fianc.*, II, XXI1.

3 *P. L.*, 71, 1097-1098.

4 Published by Haase, in 1853.

5 *P. L.*, 71, 161-572. Fr. trans, by Guizot. 1S23, Guadet and Taratine, 1836-1838. H. BORDIER 1859-1862.

0 The greater part of the reign of Childebert II.

? Gregory who roundly denounces crime and vice wherever he meets them, whether in the princes or the clergy, none the less occasionally displays exaggerated indulgence for those who have served the Church even though they gave proof of knaverv in other matters. This was not due to any defect in his character, but rather to his exaggerated view of the apologetical value of history.

8 See, for the value of his witness, H. Leclercq, *op. at.*, col. I75°*I753·

II. SAINT GILDAS THE WISE [1].

Saint Gildas the Wise is chiefly known for his *De excidio Brittanies*[*], a kind of indictment, well termed "*Liber querulus*", (3 books written about 569). This British Jeremiah paints a darkling picture of the British isles at the time *of* the Saxon invasions. He lashes with his tongue the nobles, the people and even the secular clergy : only the monks escape his scorn. His impetuous zeal led him to make unjust accusations, as Salvian had done before him. The story of his life is known only from the writings of two hagiographers, one in the Xilth century possessing no value, and another in the Xlth century, by Vital, abbot of Ruis, writing about 1050 whose documentation appears somewhat faulty. We can at least give credence to the story that Gildas preached the Gospel in Ireland, although this country was far from having fallen into the state of paganism that Vital supposes. According to local tradition, Saint Gildas followed the British emigrants to Armorica and ended his clays at Ruis where he founded the famous monastery that bears his name. Various critics distinguishing two saints of the name of Gildas, give the place of his death as Ireland or Great Britain. M. Fonsagrives warmly defends the thesis of Gildas' preaching in Brittany. He has not succeeded in convincing everybody ; he has, at least, very opportunely evoked the legendary austerity of the sturdy Breton saint.

III. THE VENERABLE BEDE (673-735)[3].

The Venerable Bede did for England what Cassiodorus had done for Italy, Saint Isidore for Spain, and Saint Gregory of Tours for France. He appears to have been providentially chosen to bring to his countrymen the knowledge of Christian patristic antiquity. At his coming, the Anglo-Saxons were still coming into the Church. Their conversion, begun about the year 600 by St. ¿Augustine of Canterbury, was only completed in the last years of the century when the faith impregnated the mass of the people. This achievement is due in great measure to *Saint Theodore,* a native of Cilicia, Archbishop of Canterbury from 668 to 691. Theodore was a fine organiser and helped to plant in England the

[1] J. Fonsagrives, 5. *Gildas de Ruis et la société bretonne au VIe siècle,* Paris, 1908.

[a] *P. L.,* 69, 329-392.

[l] Editions : *P'. L.,* 90-95 (Giles' ed., London 1843-1844). Studies : Montalembert, *Les moines d'Occident,* v (1867), p. 59-104. K. WERNER, *Beda der EhrwurdÌRe undseine Zeil,* Vienna. 1881 (2nd cd.) F. PLAINE, *Le I. bède docteur de l Eglise,* in *Revue anglo-romaine,* 1896 (t. Ill), p. 49-96; *Bède (le Vèn.),* m *Dut bibl.,* col. 1538-1542. P. Godet, *Bède le Vén.,* in thdoi'^ cok 5231-5?7. H. Quentin, *Bède le Vén.* in *Did. Arch.,* col. 632-648. H. Thurston in *Cath. Encyc.,* vol. n, p. 6S4-686

seeds of a sturdy Christian intellectual culture[1].* Bede was the foremost labourer in this field.

Bede was born of an Anglo Saxon family and while still a young boy entered the newly founded monastery at Jarrow where study was held in high esteem. Bede advanced rapidly in all branches of knowledge. He began to write after he had been made a priest when he was thirty years old, and from that time until his death (735) he remained an indefatigable scholar, respected and consulted by the whole of England, not only by the monks, but also by bishops and kings. There is no serious reason to think that he visited Rome, as has been supposed. He apparently remained in his monastery where he gained a reputation for learning and virtue. The name of *Venerable* was given him very soon after his death as a sort of popular canonisation. This was not confirmed until Leo Nili declared him a Doctor of the Church in 1899.

Bede's works are numerous; three years before he died, he drew up a list of the works he had written until that time *(Hist, etcì.,* V, 24) in which he mentions 45 writings. The majority treat of the various branches of theology, but many also deal with more general and even secular subjects. We will class these writings in three groups according to their subject.

i. Writings of general interest and divers works.

In this group we must include what the editors term his didactic works *{opera didascalia).* Among these, is a treatise " *De orthographia* ," another "*De arte metrica**", and a third " *De Schematibus et Tropis**·"*;* The " *De natura rerum*" is a little treatise on cosmography[5] to which may be added various writings on time, the Paschal cycle[6] and even an opusculum on thunder[7]. The long work *De temporum ratione ends with* a *Chronicle*[8] of the six ages of the world, written in the manner of St. Isidore.

[1] The monk of Lerins, *Benedict Biscop,* an Anglo-Saxon whom Theodore brought with him, founded the monasteries of WearmQuth and Jarrow, both noted for their studies in ecclesiastical sciences. Another monk, Adrian, an African by birth, who also came over with Theodore, founded schools where all branches of knowledge were studied.

P. L., 90, 123-150. —[3] *Ibid.,* 149-176. —[4] *Ibid.,* 175-176. — *5/bid,* 187-278.

[6] *Ibid.,* 277-292 *(De temporibus),* 293-578 *(De temporum ratione),* 579-600 *(De ratione computi), 599-606 (De celebratione Pascha·),* 607-610 *(De ordinationeferiarum paschalium).*

[7] *Ibid.,* 609-614. Other similar writings are attributed to him without sufficient proof.

[8] *Ibid.,* 520, sq. Cf. *Mon. germ, hist.,* 1895 (t. Xiv) ; ed. Mommsen.

The Venerable Bede's sixteen letters concerning various secular and sacred subjects may also be included in this group. Many form veritable treatises [1].

The poetry of Bede is lost, notably a book of *epigrams*. It is very doubtful whether the *hymns* that bear his name are those drawn from a book of hymns that he himself mentions[2]. There remains extant, however, a *libellus precum*[3] together with a hymn *To Virginity* inserted in the *History*[4] and a metrical life of *St. Cuthbert*[5].

2. Historical works.

The life of St. Cuthbert in prose[6] in much greater detail than the poem mentioned above, together with a collection[7] of the lives of five English abbots are very valuable historical documents. His masterpiece, however, is undoubtedly the *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*.

The Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum[8] treats not only of religion but also of social and political history. It has rightly deserved for its author the title of *Father of English History*. "It is divided into five books. After beginning with the first contacts between the Britons and the Romans, in which it is reminiscent of Gildas, Orosius and St. Prosper of Aquitania, it soon takes on a personal style and quality, bringing the narrative to an end in 731. The affairs of Church and State, religious traditions and events of all kinds are embodied in a single account; Bede confounds the destinies of clergy and laity much as did St Gregory of Tours. In reality this work is a chronicle... a collection of stories in chronological order and dated accorded to the Christian computation. The most competent judges nevertheless recognise in Bede a learned chronicler, fully conscious of his responsibility, a clever and sound critic, an exact, clear and elegant writer who is read with pleasure and who is worthy of credence" [9].

3. Exegetical Works.

The list of Bede's exegetical works is long and important. It includes *homilies* and *commentaries*.

[1] *P. L.*, 94, 655-710. — [3] *Ibid.*, 606 638. — [3] *Ibid.*, 515-529.
[4] *Hist, eccl.*, IV, 20. — [5] *P. L.*, 94, 575 596.
[6] *Ibid.*, 735-790 Mabillon's observations, (col. 729-734).
[7] *Ibid.*, 713-730 Mabillon's notes, 711-713.
[8] *P. L.*, 95, 23-290. Other edition, A. Holder, Leipsic, 1882, 1890.
[9] P. Godet, *op. cit.*, col. 526. Under Bede's name have been published various martyrologies, particularly one in verse (Ed. by Achery; *P. L.*, 94, 603-606';. None of these may be considered as the work of the monk of Jarrow, although their authors drew largely on his authentic works. Bede himself declared that he had written a martyrologium ; an endeavour to reconstitute this is now being made. See H. Quentin, *op. cit.*, col. 636-644.

The Venerable Bede's authentic homilies are contained in two books, each containing 25, according to Mabillon's edition[1] in which they are separated from 109 others wrongly ascribed to Bede[2]. They consist of sermons, meant primarily for the monks of the abbey; they comment on the *gospels* for the chief feasts of the year. It is natural that an allegorical interpretation should predominate in these works that were meant for edification as well as instruction.

The commentaries cover a wider field and extend to almost the whole of the Scriptures.

Old Testament: In addition to a *Hexaemeron*[3] on the beginning of Genesis as far as the birth of Isaac, Bede gives an explanation of each of the books of the *Pentateuch*[4] and a study on the *tabernacle* and the sacred vestments[5]. After a long allegorical development on Samuel[6] and a short exclusion on the Books of Kings[7], he deals with Solomon's temple[8], explains Esdras and Nehemias[9] at length and Tobias more succinctly[10].[*] Among the *didactic works* is an allegorical commentary on the Book of Proverbs[11] and an opusculum *De. muliere forti;*[12] the Canticles (7 books)[13] and lastly the Song of Habacuc[14]

In the New Testament, Bede made a complete commentary on the four Gospels, the Acts[15], the Catholic Epistles[16], and the Apocalypse[*7]. Bede also drew on St. Augustine for a comprehensive commentary of the Epistles of St. Paul; but his work was later[18] so much interpolated that it is now impossible to know what part he wrote himself.

The better to judge the Venerable Bede's exegesis we must distinguish those commentaries in which he borrowed from his forerunners, from those rarer ones in which he had to "fly with his own wings". "In the first case, Bede explains with great clearness the literal and moral meaning of each verse taken separately, nearly always however

1 *P. L.*, 94, 9-268. One homily is missing in this edition. Mabillon's work has been continued and completed by D. Morin, *Rev. ben.*, 1892 (t. IX), p. 316-326. See H. Quentin, *op. cit.*, col. 633-636.

2 *P. L.*, 94, 267-516. The apocryphal homily 70 is quoted in the breviary for the Feast and Octave of All Saints. Morever, 80 or 90 of these apocryphal homilies were drawn piecemeal from his authentic works.

3 *P. L.*, 61, 9-190 (4 books, borrowed from St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome and St. Augustine). — 4 *P. L.*, 91, 189-394.

5 *Ibid.*, 393-498 (in 3 books). — 6 *Ibid.*, 499-714 (4 books).

7 *Ibid.*, 715-736. — *Ibid.*, 735-808. — 9 *Ibid.*, 807-924.— 10 *Ibid.*, 923-938.

" *Ibid.*, 937-1040. — 12 *Ibid.*, 1039-1052. With some fragments.

*3 *Ibid.*, 1065-1236.

14 *Ibid.*, 1235-1254. A commentary on Job appears to be lost.

15 *P. L.*, 92, 9-132; 131-302; 301-634; 633-638; 937-996 (two supplements).

16 *P. L.*, 93, 9-130. — *Ibid.*, 129-206. — 18 *P. L.*, 119, 279-419.

constraining himself to be no more than the echo of St. Augustine, St. Jerome and the other Fathers who had already dealt with the same subject. — In the second, on the contrary, he would appear to neglect in a great measure the literal sense, in order to give freer play to the mystical and allegorical signification in the manner of St Gregory the Great in his Moralia on Job " L In spite of these shortcomings, it was Bede's exegetical works in particular that made him one of the chief masters in the Middle Ages.

IV. THE PENITENTIAL BOOKS2 3

We must now make some reference to a class of works for the most part anonymous, that first made its appearance when the flow of Patristic writings was drying up in the West. These are the Penitential Books. This is the name given to books containing an indication of the works of satisfaction to be performed in order to obtain pardon for every sin. These works were obviously proportionate both in severity and duration to the faults committed. " For the graver crimes : incest, parricide, perjury etc., they prescribe, according to the circumstances, either *exile* or *seclusion* in a monastery for life, or for ten or seven or three years. For lesser sins satisfaction consists in *fasting* either for a long period or intermittently, or again in *prayers*^ flagellations, almsgiving etc. " 3.

It has been supposed that the Western penitential books originally came from Rome where they were first used ; but this thesis is unfounded. A careful study of the documents, clearly shows that they were first found in the Christian Celtic communities of Ireland and Great Britain. *The earliest known penitential books* 4 in Celtic Britain are linked with the names of David and Gildas, and in Ireland with that of St. Finnian ; but these attributions are very doubtful. Later attributions are more certain, though it is almost impossible to reconstitute their primitive content from documents that have been often copied

1 F. Plaine, *Diet. Bibl.,* col. 1539. See also Cornely, Intr. gen. n. 244.

2 See A. BOUDHINON, *Snr Γhistoire de la penitence,* in *Rev. hist. liti, rei.,* 1S97 (t. Il), p. 496 sq. P. Fournier, *Etude sur les pénitentiels, ibid,* 1901-1904. A. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnunsen der abendlichen Kirche,* Halle, 1851. J. SCHMITZ, *Die Bussbücher u. d. Bussdisciplin der K.,* 1883 ; *Die Bussbiicher u. d. Kanonische Bussverfaharen,* 1898. B. Bkat, *Les livres pénitentiaux et la pénitence tarifée,* Brignais, 1910. L. Gougaud, *Les chrétientés celtiques,* Paris, 1911, p. 274-278.

3 L. Gougaud, *op. cit.,* p. 274-275.

4 *B. L.,* 96, 1315-1342 (Martène's ed.). Cf. Wasserschleben. *op. cit.,* 103 sq.

and retouched. The best known of these books are those of the Celt Cummian* (vuth cent.) and in the Anglo Saxon Church, those of *Theodore* of Canterbury[1], the Venerable *Bede** and St. *Egbert* of York[2]. The use of the penitentials in the Celtic Church had obviously passed into the Saxon Church. They also passed over to the continent through the medium of the Irish monks who emigrated *to Gaul.* There even exists a penitential book of *St. Columba* of Luxeuil[3] (d. 615) which in its essential elements at least, seems to be authentic. "The Frankish Church did not content itself with borrowing from the penitential books brought by the missionaries from Britain: well used to canonical discipline it formed its own scale of penances in order to apply the new discipline. These consist in canonical series that more or less coincided with the Celtic and British series. In the ixth century, probably abetted by the Frankish conquest, the use of the penitentials crossed the mountains; it is then we find the penitential books *in Italy;* the earliest are transpositions of Frankish works, whilst the last add special material proper to the peninsula to the Frankish element"[4].*

It has been said that private penance and its reiteration as implied by the penitential books, was purely monastic in its beginnings and that it was only later that it was practised by the laity[7]. Columba's influence was undoubtedly effective [8]9but not as much as this opinion supposes. The change that is ascribed to him was not so much his work[9] as "the end of a long evolution accomplished by successive amendments"[10] due to the influence of various causes[11]. It would be equally exaggerated to claim that the function of the priest as judge in confession was also derived from this scaled penance and the penitential books; the *judicium sacerdotis* is mentioned much earlier in many and various documents [12]. What, with greater probability, did derive from these scales of penance was "the system of equivalences and commutations of works of satisfaction",

[1] *P. L.,* 87, 978-998. Cf. Schmitz, *op. cit.,* 1883, p. 602-676.
[2] *P. L.,* 99, 901-1231. See above p. 272.
[3] Martene, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum, 1717,* iv, p. 31-56. Cf. Schmitz, (*op. cit.,* p. I, 556-564; π, 654-659) who rejects its authenticity.
[4] *P. L.,* 89, 401-431 (very doubtful).
[5] *P. L.,* 80, 223-230.
[6] P. Fournier, *op. cit.,* 1904, p. 103.
[7] E. Loening, *Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenrechts,* Strasburg, 11, p. 468. See also A. Malnory, *Quid luxovienses monachi,* p. 62 sq.
[8] See above p. 208.
[9] Mgr Duchesne notes that the Frankish episcopate appreciated him too little to accept such innovations from him; and further that they are found in places where he had no influence. *Bulletin critique,* 1883 (t. iv), p. 306.
[10] P. Batiffol, *Etudes d'hist. et de théol. jos.,* 1st series, p. 192-193.
[11] See. above, p. 138.,
[12] See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 166169.

practices that perhaps contributed " to facilitate the introduction of indulgences in the proper meaning of the term " *.

CHAPTER IV.

Oriental canonists, hagiographers and ascetics.

Special bibliography : see the notes for each author.

I. CANONISTS.

A) John III, the Scholastic 2. The Nomocanons.

One of the chief characteristics of Byzantine ecclesiastical legislation is its close connection with civil law and the frequent excursions of the secular power into its domain. The *nomocanon* is the outstanding example of this. One of the bitter fruits of this confusion of the two orders was to be the gradual and complete embodiment in Byzantine Canon Law of laws permitting *divorce,* both for adultery and other reasons. The drawing up of the first nomocanon (codex containing ecclesiastical and imperial legislation in religious or mixed matters), is sometimes ascribed to John the Scholastic. But this is erroneous, for John contributed only very indirectly to this work.

John the Scholastic was a lawyers of Antioch, who, having become a cleric at the age of 47, was then sent to the Byzantine Court as apocrisarius by the Bishop of Antioch. An ambitious and clever man. he soon found favour and was named Patriarch of Constantinople in 565. As John III he occupied this see for 12 years. He died in 577. Should this John the Scholastic be identified with *John Malalas* 4 (Arab word meaning rhetor or lawyer)3

* L. Gougaud, *of. cit.,* p. 276-277. These commutations or reductions, says the same author, were called *arrea,* from the old Irish *arra* i. e., equivalent. There existed at that time perhaps, collections *De Arreis.* A short Irish treatise (about the Vliith cent.) has recently been published on this subject. *Revue celtique,* 1894 (t. XV), p. 4S5-498.

3 See Mgr L. Petit, *fean le Scholastique,* in *Diet, thiol.·,* col. 829-831. J. I'ARGOIRE, *L'Eglise byzantine,* passim.

3 *Scholastique* σχολαστικό meant in the idiom of the time, a *lawyer.* At this period many bearing the name of John are called scholastic. Cf. below, p. 282.

4 Thesis by J. Haury, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift,* IQ00 (t. IX), p. 337-^6, admitted by L. Petit, *op. cit.,* col. 829.

he must be counted as having written before 550 the 17 first books of his *Universal History* or *Chronography,* which he continued at Constantinople and brought up to the year 574[x]. His fame, however, was chiefly gained as a jurist [1].

He had already written an important canonical work at Antioch. There had existed since the year 535 a *methodical collection* of conciliary canons under *60 titles:* this was the first known for the East. John completed it by adding St. Basil's canons, but reduced the whole tojo *titles:* hence the title of his work : Collection of 50 titles [3]. He re-edited his work at Constantinople and composed a similar one for the *imperial ordinances* on religious matters (novellae 6, 5, 84, 46, 120. 56, 57, 3, 32, 131, 67, 123, 83): this is the Collection of 87 Chapters [4] that appeared about 570. In this wise John III paved the way for the first *nomocanon;* but it would not seem that he was personally responsible for its.

I'hc first nomocanon, termedNomocanon of 50 titles[6], first appeared under the Emperor Maurice (582-602) and is hardly more than the collected canonical work of John ill[7]. It had however but little effect, for under the Emperor Heraclius (610-641) it was soon superseded by the *nomocanon of the 14 titles.* Photius did little more than revise and complete this latter work[8]. The nomocanons as we have already remarked, were largely responsible for the confusing of the civil and religious law that characterises Byzantine legislation [9]

The legislation of the Council in Trullo (691-692)[10] emphasised in an even greater measure both this and the anti-Roman bias. The latter was already very evident in the official modifications of the *Syntagma* (chronological collection of canons) : in this document the

1 See below, p. 2S2.

2 See Fr. Biener, *De collectionibus canonum Ecclesia graca,* Berlin 1S27, p. 12-14. ZAChariE VON Lingenthal, *Historia /uris graco-romani delineatio,* Heidelberg, 1839, p. 32-33.

3 Edit. G. Voell, and II. JUSTELL, *Bibl. /uris can. veteris,* Paris, 1661, II, p. 499-660 *(Collectio canonum eccl. in L titulos divisa).*

4 Edit., G. E. Heimbach, *Anecdota,* Leipsic, 1840, ii, p. 202-234 *(Collectio LXXXVII capitulo*urn).* See also Pitra, 1868.

5 See note 7. According to Photius, John HI wrote a *Catechisti^ Discourse* on the Trinity *(Bibl.,* cod. 75) and John of Niku mentions a *Mystagogy, of* conciliatory nature in Christological matters. These works are lost.

6 VOELL-JUSTELL, *Op. cit.,* II, 603-660.

7 Another collection, termed "of the 22 chapters", very similar to this nomocanon *(Voell-Justell, ibid.,* 660-672) was attributed to John by Pitra; but it would seem in reality to be a derivation from the nomocanon of 50 titles : this is the opinion of Zachariæ v. L.

8 VOELL-JUSTELL, *Op. cit,,* II, 813-II40.

9 J. Pargoire, *D Eglise Byzantine,* p. 78-79.

10 *Ibid.,* p. 200-203.

Council of Sardica was given last place, while on the contrary the canons of African councils, unfavourable to Rome, were admitted. ' Not content with confirming all this, the Council *in Trullo* added thereto 102 new canons*, in which the Oriental uses are often opposed to lhe Latin customs which were judged detestable. The whole of this work which, says Fr. Pargoire " undoubtedly constitutes the most considerable official monument of disciplinary legislation at Byzantium", was eventually destined to be an unsurmountable obstacle to the reunion of the two parts of the Church.

B) John IV, the Faster. Penitential discipline[2].

John IV, the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople from 582 to 595, venerated throughout the East for his reputation *tor austerity,* is chiefly known in the West for his controversy with St. Gregory the Great on the subject of the *oecumenical* title [3]. He is also famous for various *writings* on *penance;* but these are of doubtful authenticity. Of the three edited by Migne [4], the first, a penitential, is of much later date, probably xith or Xllth century; the second, a sermon for penitents, is from the same date ; the third alone, a homily on penance, continence and virginity, may really be John's. Pitra attributes a few other opuscula to him [5], but this attribution is not proved.

Apart from the authenticity of these writings, we know from other sources the state of penitential discipline at this period [6].

The power of absolution, was everywhere imputed to the Church in the person of the bishop, in spite of the authors' insistence on the evident truth that it is God, in reality, Who pardons, and men are no more than collaborators. At this time the *priest* had already received from the bishop at least the power of hearing the confession of sins and of seeing to the performance of the penance. St. Basil also attributed to them the power of absolution : according to him the monks confessed their faults to those who have received the power of dispensing the mysteries[7]. The same doctrine was popularised by the apostolic canons (n. 52). Nevertheless the stress that certain writers laid on the moral qualities necessary to the confessor led to more than one abuse both in the monasteries and outside : simple monks, honoured with the title of

* Edit. Ralli and PoTLl, Σύνταγμα των θειων καί Ιερών κανόνων, 6 vols., Athens, 1852-1859*. vol. 295*554-

[2] R. Janin, *Jean IV le J.,* in *Diet, theol.,* col. 828-829.

[3] See above, p. 237. Cf. S. Vailhé, *Constantinople (Eglise de),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1133-1135.

[4] *P. G.,* 88, 1889-1978. — [5] *Spicilegium Solesmense.* IV, p. 416-444.

[6] See J. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* p. 94, 226-347. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 252-260. E. Vacandard, *Confession* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 861-874.

[7] This must mean priests, remarks J. Tixeront, p. 254.

spirituals claimed for themselves, sometimes exclusively, the right of confessing and absolving '.

In principle, confession was secret; self accusation in public was the satisfaction required only for great and notorious crimes. The better to facilitate the confession of mortal sins, certain authors reduced them to 7 or 8 types (the capital vices or sins of the early ascetic authors)' ; others made use of detailed lists of sins, indicating the corresponding penances (penitential books)[3].

Satisfaction or the *exomologesis* became gradually milder : already at this time it was often preceded by absolution while the penances were less severe than formerly. Not that public penance had entirely disappeared however; mentions of it is found in contemporary canonical documents; sometimes, indeed, it was extremely severe, i. e., for the monks. It should be noted lastly that the practice of *confession* was becoming more general, especially among the monks. It does not appear, however, to have been obligatory.

II. HISTORIANS AND HAGIOGRAPHERS.

A) Historians.

The one really outstanding historian of this period was *Evagrius Scholasticus.* There were other chroniclers of varying merit.

Évagrius Scholasticus[4] (d. about 600) was born in Celesyria about 536, and became a lawyer at Antioch. He was greatly esteemed by the Patriarch of Antioch, Gregory (570-593) whom he defended several times at Constantinople, and in whose name he drew up several reports (not extant). He was also in favour at court; the Emperor Tiberius II made him quaestor, and Maurice conferred on him the honorary title of prefect. He is known chiefly for his *Ecclesiastical History*[5] in 6 books, containing an account of theChristological controversies from 431 to 594, the probable date of the appearance of the work. Religious events formed the author's main interest, though when the occasion demanded he also touched on secular matters. His information was drawn from the best sources; letters, official reports, and various works, though some passages betray his exaggerated

1 See above p. 101.

2 See vol. I, p. 510 and 597 ; and above p. 246.

3 The lists of penances given by early authors such as St. Basil (cf. vol. I, p. 415, 444), referred to public penance. The penilentials of the eighth and later centuries were for the guidance of confessors in private penance.

4 S. Vailhé, *Evagte le Sch.,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 1612-1613. J. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* p. 138.

5 *P. G.,* 86, 2415-2886 (ed. Valois). J. Bidez and L. Parmentier, in *Byzantine Texts,* London, 1889.

taste for prodigies. On the whole he was a truthful and unbiased historian. His style is agreeable, though Photius thinks it somewhat verbose [1].

Various chronicles were written at this time in the East and form the counterpart of those produced in the West by such as Isidore of Seville and the Venerable Bede: some, it is true, have but remote connections with ecclesiastical literature; such a one is the *Chronography of* John Malalas or *John the Rhetor*[2]; which is more apt to interest the vulgar than instruct the leained. It covers the period from the beginning of history until the death of Justinian (565) with a continuation as far as 574.

A certain John of Antioch also wrote in the Vith century a *Universal History of* which fragments remain [3]. Nothing else is known of him.

The most important chronographical work of this period is anonymous, the Chronicon paschales which deals more extensively with religious matters. It betrays the hand of a Byzantine clerk belonging to the household of Sergius, patriarch from 610-638. The name of *paschale* was given to it on account of a dissertation on Christian chronology based on the paschal computation, with which the work begins. This chronicle is somewhat lacking in originality; the facts that concern the beginning of the vith century alone are of interest.

On the contrary, the *Universal Chronicle of* John of Niku, written about 700, is rich in detail and particularly valuable for the history *ol* the Vllth century. The work is extant only in an Ethiopian version[6].

B) Hagiographers.

It is in the form of hagiography that history is henceforth to be found in the East. Writers were many, drawn from nearly all the ranks of the clergy and the monks. Father Pargoire mentions some fifty of these Lives that he used in making his book[7]. To these must be added the Martyria in order to form a satisfactory idea of the hagiographical movement in the East, which equalled and even surpassed the contemporary and similar work achieved in the West, particularly by Fortunatus and Gregory of Tours. The best known of sixth century Oriental hagiographers was *Cyril of Scythopolis* who has already been mentioned[8]. Later writers are less remarkable. The seventh century brought with it *John Moschus* and his friend *Saint Sophronius*. The latter, however, is better known as a theologian of the Incarnation[9], and will be mentioned again later.

[1] *Bibliotheca,* cod. 29. For the Monophysite historian John of Asia, see above p. 70.

[2] *P. G.*, 97, 65-718 (Ed. Dindorf, 1883).

[3] For the identification of John Malalas with John the Scholastic, see above, p. 278. — [4] Edit. Müller, *Farg. hist, grar.,* iv, 536-626.

[5] *P. G.,* 92, 9-1160 (Ed. Dindorf, 1883).

[6] Text and trans, by H. Zotenberg, Paris, 1883. Account by the same in *Journal asiatique,* 1887, n. 15 (published separately, 1879).

[7] *L'Eglise byzantine,* Bibliogr., p. XVin-XX.

[8] See above, p. 113.

[9] See chapter VI, p. 303.

Our knowledge of **John Moschus**[1] is found especially in his *Spiritual Meadow*[2], for this work gives us a portrait of its author, no less bright than that of the monks with whom it deals. It does not contain a series of lives, but is rather a collection of anecdotes, each in its way instructive. "Virtuesand vices are marvellously reflected in this truthful mirror" says S. Vailhé, "edifying incidents, heroic austerity, childish visions, old wives' tales; all this is found in inextricable confusion, told naively without any seeking after style, though the author's preferences are very evident. We are shown a vivid picture of religious life in the monasteries of Palestine, before the Persian and Arab invasions struck it a mortal blow and brought about its decay"[3]. No one knew this *monastic life* better than Moschus who lived it for many years in the principal monasteries of the region.

Father Vailhé[4] has determined the chief dates in the life of this monastic wandering Jew in his unending quest for fresh instances of virtue. Born at Damascus about the middle of the vith century, he became a monk in Palestine, where he remained twelve years. In 578, together with his friend Sophronius, from whom he was never more to be separated, he set out for Egypt; after a visit to the Thebaid and another stay of twelve years at Sinai, he returned to Palestine about 594. About 605 he left the country which was being threatened by the Persians and, after a journey in North Syria, came back to Egypt where he acted as counsellor to several patriarchs, notably St. John the Almsgiver (d. 619) whose life he wrote. In 614, still accompanied by Sophronius he went to Rome, where he died about 619, leaving to his friend the duty of publishing his notes (the 219 chapters of the *Spiritual Meadow*[5]) and of finishing the life of *St. John the Almsgiver* that they had begun together.

There were many minor hagiographers[6]. These are indicated below:

I. **Eustratius**, priest of Constantinople (vith. cent.): life of St. Eutychius[6], patriarch (d. 582).

[1] S. Vailhé, *Jean Mosch,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1902 (t. v) p. 107-116. J. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* 140. P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne,* i, p. 444-448. — [2] *P. G.,* 87, 2855-3112 (or *P. L.,* 74, 119-240). See vol. 1, p. 500.

[3] *Op. cit.,* p. 107.

[4] In *Echos d'Orient, l. c.* See also *Revue de l'Orient chrét.,* 1902-1903: study on St. Sophronius. Cf. below, p. 304.

[5] See J. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* p. 247-248, 378, and general bibliogr. p. xvni sq.

[6] *P. G.,* 86, 2273-2390.

2. St. John the Almsgiver (d. 617): life of St. Tychon

3. Leontius of Neapolis (Cyprus), vnth cent.: lives of St. John the Almsgiver (more complete than that of Moschus) and St. Simeon the simple *.

4. Leontius of St. Sabas (Rome): life of St. Gregory *of* Agrigentum 24

5. Stephen of Melos (vmth cent.) : life of 20 Sabaite monks killed by the Bedouins (769)·*.

6. Ignatius of Nicea (ixth cent.) : lives of the patriarchs of Constantinople, St. Tarasius and St. Nicephoruss.

5. *Methodius,* Patriarch from 843 to 847, composed several Lives, and also attempted a collection of Lives or **martyria**6. A century later *Simeon,* grand chancellor at the Court of Byzantium, revived this project and began to collect early lives of the saints. He succeeded in bringing 120 of these together7; unfortunately he lacked critical judgment and not only corrected the style, whose simplicity shocked him, but also abridged and amplified early accounts. Hence the relative inferiority of a work that might have been excellent. It was for a long period a popular work of edification among the faithful89

III. ORIENTAL ASCETICS.

A) Saint John Climacus 9.

The most popular of Oriental ascetics in the period now under review is Saint John Climacus, though other writers,

1 Ed. H. Usener. *Sonderbare Heilige,* 1, Leipsic, 1907.

2 *P. L.,* 93, 1613-1660 and 1669-1748. The first re-edited by H. Gelzer, Freiburg, 1893. To these should be added a *Life of St. Sfyridon,* a treatise *Against the Jews (P. G.,* 93, 1597 sq.) and two discourses, sometimes attributed to others of the same name. — 3 *P. G..* 98, 549-716.

4 *Aeta. Sanet.,* mart, til, 2*-i2*. Cf. Pargoire, *op. at.,* p. 378.

s Edit. 18S0, 1881. Cf. Pargoire. — 6 J. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* p. 37S.

7 *P. L.,* 114-116. See Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius,* I, col. 918-921.

8 The Life of Barlaam and Joasaph, so much in vogue in the Middle Ages, was no more than a religious fiction, based on a Hindoo iegend and the apologia of Aristides (see vol. 1, p. **ill**). Here is the story : The Indian king Abenner learns on the birth of his son Joasaph (or Josaphat) that the latter is destined to be a Christian. In order to conjure this misfortune he has him brought up in solitude and keeps from his notice anything that could possibly sadden him. But in spite of all these precautions, Joasaph becomes aware of the existence of sickness, of old age and death and begins to reflect wisely upon them. At last, lhe Christian monk, Barlaam, manages to approach him and converts him. —There is little doubt that this legend derives from the Hindoo legend of Bhudda's conversion to asceticism. The Christian adaptation was probably made by a monk of St. Sabas (Palestine) at the beginning of the VIIth cent. See J. Van den Gheyn, *Barlaam et Josaphat,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 410-416. Cf. *Rev. Quest, hist.,* 1880 (t. 28), p. 579-600. As for admitting, from such data, the existence of Bhuddic influences on Christianity, and particularly Christian ascetism. that is undeniably a fresh legend, far more unlikely than the first.

9 Editions: A *G.,* 88, 6911210 (ed. Rader, 1633). SOPHRONIOS, Constantinople, 1883, 190 pp. (Greek text; scarcely better than the other edition).

St. Maximus the Confessor and Saint Theodore of Studium, both produced works of equal value.

Very little is known of his life. According to the Greek liturgy, he entered the monastery of Sinai at the age of sixteen; when he was twenty he began to lead the life of a hermit at the foot of the holy mountain, and forty years later was elected abbot of Sinai; at this period he composed his famous "*Scala Paradisi*". His *life* written by Daniel of Raithu [1], tells us nothing more. We possess no certain information that enables us to determine the exact period of the saint's life. The critics were until now, generally agreed on the sixth century; Bardenhewer puts his death about 600. A growing body of opinion, however, inclines to make him a contemporary of the VIIth century. After a study of fresh documents, Nau fixes 649 as the date of his death[2]. This provides an explanation of the striking similarities between the end of John's work and Saint Gregory's *Pastoral:* it is possible that the Abbot of Sinai was acquainted with the pope's work [3].

Mgr Petit has endeavoured to reconstitute the first part of the saint's life from other sources than the liturgy. Basing himself on the title of Scholastic (lawyer) given by all the manuscripts to John Climacus, he identifies him with John the Scholastic, priest (abbas) of whom John Moschus speaks[4,5] and with John the Rhetor (word synonymous with Scholastic) mentioned by Sophronius [6]. This person was witness of a miracle in favour of this same Sophronius at Alexandria about 610 [6]. According to Sophronius, this rhetor, John, was the favourite disciple of Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria from 580 to 607; he came with him from Antioch to Alexandria where he lost his wife. He probably became a monk before 600, if he was a priest in 607 (according to Moschus). He must have loeen born therefore in the middle of the

Studies': Mgr. L. Petit, *Jean Climaque (saint)* in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 690-693. [illegible] *St. Jean Climaque,* in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift,* 1902 (t. xi), p. 35-38. J. Pargoire, *Eglise byz.,* p. 251; *Echos d' Orient,* 1905 (t. 8), p. 372'373. S. Salaville, *S. Jean Climaque : sa vie et son oeuvre,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1923 (t. 22), p. 440-454. A. Saudreau, *Doct. spirit, de S. Jean Climaque,* in *Vie spirit.,* 1924 (t. 9), p. 353-370. P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrét.,* p. 453-469. — [1] *P. G.,* 88, 595-608.

[2] Both Tixeront and Salaville admit this date (SALAVILLE, *op. cit.,* p. 441-446). J. Pargoire places his period of office between 631 and 645 approximately : 20 years. (*Er I. byz.,* p. 251). See however, Mgr. Petit's objection, *op. cit.,* col. 690.

[3] "Gregory the Theologian" quoted by John (*Grad,* x.xii; col. 949) would evidently be Gregory the Great and not Gregory Nazianzen. Cf. L. Petit, *op. cit.,* col. 692. — [4] *Spiritual Meadow,* c. 102.

[5] See S. *Vailhé,* in the *Orient chrét.,* 1902 (t. vu), p. 375*379-

[6] See below, p. 304.

vith century in Syria, and elected abbot *of* Sinai in the first part of the vu century when he composed his famous ascetic work at the request of John *of* Raithu. This would furnish an explanation of the popularity of the title *of* Scolastic given to John, and the place occupied in his work by the descriptions and habits of the Egyptian monks whom he appears to have known personally; facts that are not clear from the traditional liturgical life. The author's style implies a sound culture consonant with this opinion, which, though still hypothetical, seems very possible, and throws much light on the character of this great ascetic.

The work of Saint John Climacus which he compares to Jacob's ladder (preface) or the thirty years of the life of Jesus (conclusion) is entitled by him Κλίρ,α *(ladder)* and by the Latins, Scala Paradisi r. The author rightly terms it an ascetic treatise (Λόγο ασκητικό). The reader, however, must not expect to find a logical and exact account of the successive stages to be covered on the way to perfection. The thirty degrees of the treatise are no more than the thirty chapters (or discourses λόγοι) that compose it. The greater part of the work, written for the coenobites, was devoted to *ascetic practices* in the proper meaning of the term 1

The first three form a kind of general introduction dealing with : i) renunciation of the world, 2) interior detachment), 3) the entrance into the religious life; with an appendix on dreams, as a safeguard against the illusions to which they give birth.

The ¿y *chapters* composing the body of the work treat of *vices and virtues.* The order, at first blush, seems somewhat capricious, but may be explained thus. After having spoken of obedience (4), the foundation of the coenobetic life and three subjects that are the *starting point of all ascetic endeavour* (penance, 5 ; death, 6 ; sorrow that engenders joy, 7), Saint John comes to the virtues and failings that concern one's *neighbour* (mildness, 8 ; rancour, 9 ; slander, 10 ; gossip, 11 ; lying, 12) and *oneself* (laziness, 13; gluttony, 14; chastity, 15; greed, 16; poverty, 17) and lastly the *service of God* (insensibility of the soul, 18; psalmody, 19; watching, 20). He then goes on to deal with more subtle temptations and certain virtues more needful for acquiring *perfection* (cowardice, 21 ; vainglory, 22 ; pride, 23 ; mildness and simplicity, 24; humility, 25). Chapter 26 devoted to the discernment of virtues and vices *(discretion),* brings to an end, the whole of the ascetic part by summing up all the preceding chapters and drawing a series of very instructive and picturesque comparisons.

l *P. G.t* 88, 631-1164 (Latin and Greek text and various commentaries).

- The early monks counselled the anachoretic or solitary life only to those who had long practised asceticism in the common or coenobetic life. Thus for several writers, the word *coenobite* came to mean a beginner or imperfect, and *anachorite,* perfect or contemplative.

The work ends with a short mystical treatise : ch. 27-30. Here John speaks of the *solitary* or anachoretic *lije* and holy repose ησυχία '. (27) of private prayer (28) and απάθεια and the repose of the soul freed from the turmoil of the passions (29). The thirtieth and last chapter shows that the crown of all perfection consists in the full blooming of the *three theological virtues* and especially charity, of which the author speaks in glowing terms. Like all early writers Saint John Climacus urges on his monks the perfection described in the first part of his work and pleads with them to tend thereto; and indeed, perfection such as he describes obviously implies graces and sentiments that theology attributes to the more eminent mystical graces[3].

The work was originally provided with a supplement. This was the Liber ad. Pastorem[3], a little opusculum of 15 chapters now edited separately. It explains the *duties of the superior of a monastery.* John probably drew his inspiration from St. Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis* which was translated into Greek about 600 by a patriarch of Antioch.

The treatise of the Abbot of Sinai was immensely popular from the moment of its appearance. *John of Raithu* added the first, but not the most complete gloss[4]. *Elias of Crete* (VUIth cent.), commented it, and was imitated by anonymous writers. The commentaries were occasioned by John's concise styles which sometimes, though rarely, becomes almost obscure. Great depth of thought is given to his prose by this conciseness; some of his maxims would provide enough matter for long meditation. He quotes a number of early authors, but his own experience and prayer formed his chief source of information.

B) Other writers on spirituality [6]

1. St. Zosimas (near Tyre, in first part of vith cent) : wrote on ascetic subjects[7].

2. St. John the Prophet, disciple of St. Barsanuphius and author of several letters of spiritual direction, edited together with his master's[8].

3. St. Dorotheus, also disciple of St. Barsanuphius (middle of the Vith cent.), abbot of a monastery near Gaza, was the spiritual heir of his master and enjoyed great popularity on account of his lectures on

1 From ησυχία, repose (the spiritual repose of contemplation) is derived the word *hesychastes* which means a contemplative, a perfect man, a solitary or anchorite. — 3 See *Introduction,* vol. I, p. 20-21. — 3 *j* 88, 1165-1210.

4 See his gloss in *G.,* 88, 1211-1248 *(Scholia in Climacum).* Little is known of John of Raithu save for this writing and the letter *(ibid.,* 624-625) asking John Climacus to undertake this work.

5 See S. Salaville, *op. cit.,* p. 450-452.

6 See J. Pargoire, *Eglise byz.,* p. 136-137, 250.

7 *P. G.,* 78, 1679-1702. See S. Vaii.hé, *Echos d'Orient,* 1901 (t. iv), p. 359-363-

8 S. Vaii.hé, *fean le prophète,* in *Echos d'Orient* 1905 (t. vili) p. 154 sq., See above, p. in.

spirituality, and 8 letters[1]. Evagrius' accusation of Monophysitism was unjustified (H. E., iv, 33).

4; St. Simeon Stylites the Younger (d. 596): 30 ascetic exhortations[2] are attributed to him.

5. Thalassius, an abbot in Libya about 650: *4* series of a hundred *sententia* on charity, continence and spiritual direction[3].

6. John of Carpathus, end of Vlth cent. : exhortations to the monks of India[4][5]

The monk *Antiochus of Saint Sabas* will be treated below[6].

CHAPTER V.

Melodes and Hymnographers.

Special Bibliography (on the chapter as a whole)[6].

J. B. Pitra, *Hymnographie de PEglise grecque,* Rome, 1867. E. Bouvy, *Polies et mélodes, Etude sur les origines du rythme tonique dans Vhyninographie de ΓEglise grecque,* Paris, 1886. F. CABROL, *Ehymnograp'hie de PEglise grecque,* Angers, 1893. S. Petridès, *Notes d'hymnographie byzantine,* in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift,* 1904 (t. XIII), p. 421 sq. J. Pargoire, *Eglise byzantine,* Paris, 1905. C. Emereau, *Hymnographi byzantini*(biographical, literary and bibliographical notes on ancient and modern hymnographers), in *Echos d'Orient,* 1922-1927 (7 articles). H. Leclercq, *Hymnes,* in *Diet. Arch.,* 2868-2897. Some texts in W. Christ and M. PARANIKAS, *Anthologia greeca carminum christ.,* Leipsic, 1871.

I. RHYTHMIC POETRY. ITS ORIGINS.

In the fifth century Byzantium saw the appearance of a new kind of poetry having no parallel, either in the Pagan or Christian ancient world. It was an ecclesiastical verse that had thrown off the shackles of classical metrical rules. It was characterised by two fundamental rules: the equal number of syllables in a verse *(isosyllaby)* with the accent falling on the same syllables *(homotqny).* From that arose a true rhythm, so that the new poetry rightly came to be called *rhythmic :* it was also termed *syntonic* and those who

[1] *P. G.,* 88, 1611-1838 and 1837-1S42) letters). See S. Vailhé, *ibid.*
[2] *Edit.* J. Cozza-Luzi, in *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca,* Vili (1871), Rome, 4-156.
[3] *P. G.,* 91, 1427-1470. — [4] *P. G.,* 85, 791-812.
[5] Sec p. 324. — [6] For each author, see the notes.

cultivated it were called melodes, provided they were also musicians and composed their own airs; those who did no more than adapt new words to old melodies were known as hymnographers L

The early liturgy provided for little more than the chanting of scriptural passages, especially the psalms. Even the *antiphon* (a short phrase repeated after each psalm or part of a psalm), introduced in the ivth century, had no other origin. The melodes provided the various parts of the chanted, liturgy, apart from those taken from the Scriptures. These were originally *troparia* (stanzas, first sung alternately with the last verses of the psalms); then came entire hymns or series of stanzas, preceded by the *contakion* (or prelude) which soon came to mean tie hymn itself. Later, whole nocturnal offices were composed including series of hymns: these hymns were then called *odes* and all the hymns together (usually 9) that made up the office, were called the *canon.* Each ode of the canon begins with a *hirmos,* a strophe that indicates the rhythm and melody of the following strophes or stanzas. The latter varied greatly in number; usually 5 or 6, they sometimes increased to 20 or 30 as in the odes of the Great Canon. The *versification of the canons* was in general dull and monotonous and it is to be regretted that it ended by taking the liturgical place of the truly lyrical stanzas of the early *contakia.* Lastly it should be noted that metrical poetry is represented by several hymns in the Greek liturgy.

It is not easy to trace the sources that influenced the origins and development of syntonic poetry at Byzantium. The modern tendency is to regard it as an imitation of Syriac poetry. Pitra had already suspected as much, and others endeavoured to prove it, particularly Bickell in 1885. Father Emereau (1919) especially stressed the important influence of the Greek translation of St. Ephraem after the end of the ivth century'. But whatever its sources, this new kind of poetry, till then used chiefly by the Syrians, began to flourish in the second half of the vth century on the banks of the Bosphorus. But the efforts of the first melodes, who have been called the "poets of the troparia", and who often enough were content to make pious borrowings from fourth century orators, particularly St. Gregory Nazianzen, were soon forgotten, cast into the shade by the glory of the brilliant "poet of the contakia", "the Pindar of rhythm", Saint Romanos.

II. SAINT ROMANOS λ

According to the Greek liturgical account, Romanos who was a Syrian by birth, and a deacon in the church at Berytus,

1 These two names, however, are often used indiscriminately.

' See vol. 1, p. 381.

3 Pitra, *op. cit.,* p. 47 sq. F. Bouyv, *op. cit.,* p. 367-375. Krumbacher, *Studien zti Romanos,* Munich, 1898 (with various texts; others published subsequently). Eustradiades, 'Ρωμανό ὁ Μελφόό και ὁ 'Ακάθιστο , Saloniki, 1917- E. Emereau, *op. cit.,* 1926, p. 169-172. On the cultus of St. Romanos, see *Echos d'Orient,* 1900 (in), p. 339*342·3

came to Constantinople and was incardinated into the clergy as a deacon in the Church of Blachernae in the reign of Anastasios. It is a vexed question whether the latter was *Anastasios I* (491-518) or *Anastasios II* (713-716). Pitra judged him to be the former, while others preferred the latter. Father Bouvy hesitated, but Father Pargoire and many others finally settled on Anastasios I, so that it would seem that the great poet wrote under Justinian in the sixth century [1]. Romanos is accredited with a thousand hymns *(contakia)* composed for the liturgy, which filled the early tropology (collection of troparia). Of these, unfortunately, there remain but 80, each of 24 strophes, and many are not yet published[2]. His magnificent verses, save a few strophes, were replaced in the office by the canons, about the xth century.

Krumbacher, the historian of Byzantine literature judges Romanos to have been the greatest of hymn-writers, not only in the East but in the whole of the Church; *Father Bouvy*, a great literary critic, goes, even farther in his praise. He, too, is of the opinion that his hymns truly merit a place apart, inasmuch as they are really *religious dramas**. "The poet finds his inspiration in contemplation : in this contact with God, supernatural realities came to life; he saw the patriarchsand the prophets; he heard them and meditated on their words; he contemplated the Saviour of men and His Mother, the Apostles, the Martyrs; he was present as an attentive and enthusiastic eye-witness at all those past events in which God Himself was the hero. This contemplation of the supernatural world stirred up all his powers, his mind and his heart[4]", He had need of "supple, harmonious and popular rhythms in order to translate all he had seen and heard". His verse is vigorous with life. If you will follow him, says the same author, not only through the

[1] Comparisons have been made between the songs of the first melodes (vth and vith cent.), and the flourishing theatrical spectacles that gave prestige to the Imperial Court at Constantinople. The Church suppressed anything undesirable but knew how to combine life and animation with the majesty of the liturgy, either by means of the dialogue or the almost dramatic tenor of its more solemn offices. Cf. H. Leclerq, *op. cit.*, col. 2880. This tendency however diminished later. Cf. *ibid.*, 2883.

[2] See those published in PiTR,\ *(op. cit.)*, Krumbach BR *(op. cit.)*, MAAS (in *Kleine Texte*, 1910; Christmas hymn, 1921).

[3] A quality also recognised by Pitra, and which would seem to indicate the century of Justinian and not that of the Iconoclasts.

[4] E. Bouvy, *op. cit.*, p. 367-368.

series of troparia of a single song, but through all the phases of the liturgical cycle from Christmas to Easter, to Pentecost, "you will perhaps conclude that Christendom need not envy any of the lyrical poets of the ancient world *Pitra,* for his part, determined the period of Romanos from the character of his verse. " Attic elegance combines with Roman gravity in his hymns; in his personages and their dialogue there is a dramatic pomp, a wealth of expression, a joyous freedom of movement and tone that would have been incomprehensible after the century of Justinian1". The most famous of his hymns is that for Christmas: Ἡ παρθένο σήμερον 2, which was still being sung with great pomp in the XIIth century at the Christmas banquet of t le Imperial Court, when the Church had already adopted other liturgical chants. In this hymn, more than in any other, that verbosity and prolixity which the Byzantine poet does not always escape, is occluded by the purity and depth of his inspiration and noble simplicity of style.

Various authors attribute with some probability the composition of the famous Acathistus hymn to St. Romanos 3. Its name derives from the fact that it was sung at a night office, during which, clergy and people remained standing. This hymn, which was also sung during Lent, is composed of 24 strophes, alternately long and short, each beginning with a letter of the alphabet taken in order. It is a thanksgiving hymn for the Incarnation. Of rare beauty, imbued throughout with biblical mysticism, it was written for the Feast of the Annunciation which already seems to have existed in the vith century, at least at Constantinople. The legend that the poet wrote to thank Our Lady for having delivered the town from its enemies, after the raising of a siege in the reign of Heraclius (626), or Constantine Pogonatus (677) or Leo the Isaurian (717) seems to be groundless4. This story is perhaps

1 Card. Pitra, *Anal.* I, p. xxxn.

' Edit. P. Maas, Leipsic, 1921. The following is the first of the 24 strophes of this hymn :

•Ἡ παρθένο σήμερον	Virgo hodie
Τον υπερούσιον τικτει	Ens Supremum parturit,
Και ἡ γή τό σπήλαιον	Et terra speluncam
Τώ ἀπροσίτφ προσάγει.	Inaccesso profert.

i Editions : *P. G.* 92, 1335-1348 (under the name of *G. Pisides).* Other edits. : Christ and Paranikas, *of>. cil.·,* P. de Meester, Rome, 1903. Studies : P. de Meester, *Ь Inno acatisto,* Rome 1904. S. Eustratiades, 'Ρωμανό ὁ Μελωδό , Thessalonika, 1917. A. Lauriotès, 'Ο ακάθιστο ὑμνο , Constantinople, 1893· H· Leclerq, *Acathistus,* in *Did. Arch.,* col. 213-216. C. Emereau, *0/>. cit.,* p. 259-263.

4 The prelude Τή ὑπερμάχψ seems to be a later addition, probably from the time of Photius. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus attributed the entire Acathistus to Photius, (1903). For the contrary opinion see Théarvic, *Ech. d'Or.,* 1904 (t. VII), p. 293 sq.

due to the circumstances that led St. Germanus to establish the feast at which the hymn was sung'. Its composition was traditionally attributed either to the Patriarch Sergius or to Pisides in the vnth century. We consider the attribution to St. Romanos as more likely*.

The decline of religious poetry after Romanos was to be expected. The only authors worth mention in the vnth century are ;

1. Sergius the Monothelite patriarch from 610 to 638, none of whose works are known, save the Acathistus, provided he was really its author[1]

2.G·. Pisides[4,5] deacon of Saint Sophia whose works are chiefly in the classical metre. In addition to various secular works on the emperor's victories, he wrote religious poems *of* a didactic nature (on the Creation, the vanity of life, against the theology of Severus) and a few shorter pieces. He was an exact and elegant but rather uninspired poet.

III. SAINT ANDREW OF CRETE.

AUTHORS OF LITURGICAL BOOKS.

A) Saint Andrew of Crete [5], was the greatest melode of the viiith century. The chronology of his life has been determined by Father Vailhé[6]. Born at Damascus in 660, then a monk and cleric at Jerusalem, he was sent on a mission to Constantinople about 685, and remained in that town. He became deacon of Saint Sophia, held various posts and probably about 700 was made bishop of the see of Gortyna in Crete. Amiably subservient to the Emperor Philippicus, he was weak enough to concur in the condemnation of the Vlth Oecumenical Council in 712 : but he was not long in retracting and became a zealous defender of images [7]. His death is usually placed in 720, but according to Vailhé, should be placed in 740. Saint Andrew of Crete was both *orator and poet.* As orator, he wrote speeches that make of him " the best of the Byzantine homelists and panegyrists ", says J. Pargoire. 22 speeches have been published[8], 18 others are known and it is suspected that

1 J. Pargoire, *op. cit.,* p. 335.

* Opinion held by Lauriotes, Eustratiades, Emereau, etc.

3 See the following chapter for his theological activities. The Acathistus is ascribed to him by Christ and Paranikas, Bouvy, Baumer, etc.

4 *P. G.,* 92, 1197-1754 (ed. Querci, 1777, who was the first to attribute the Acathistus to him).

5 Editions : *P. P.,* 97, (ed. Combéfls). Studies : S. Vailhé, S. *André de Crète,* in *Echos d'Or.,* 1902 (t. V), p. 378-387; and in *Diet, hist.,* col. 1659-1661. L. Petit, *André de Crète,* in *Diet. Arch.,* col. 2034-2041. E. MARIN, *André de Crète,* in *Diet, théol.,* col 1182-1184. C. EMEREAU, *op. cit., Ech. d'Or.y* 1922, p. 267-271. Russian monograph by Denisof, Moscow, 1903.

6 *Op. cit.,* in *Echos d'Orient.* — ' See below, p. 321. — a *P. G.* 97, 805-1304.

still more may be found hidden away in manuscripts. But Andrew was at his best as a melode.

Mgr Petit has made a careful study of his poetic work'. Although Andrew certainly composed a number of *hirmi* and *idiomela,* the writing of *canons* was his chief work3. He is thought to have been the creator of this new kind of poetry, which appealed to the people by the historical and doctrinal allusions that more often than not took the place of any lyrical feeling. It may be regrettable that the canons replaced the hymns of Romanos; but Andrew had neither forseen nor desired this outcome in composing his *odes.* Of his works there are extant a dozen published and a similar number of unpublished canons. He was the author of the *Great Canon*3 a penitential song, famous for its length (250 troparia) : it is sung during Lent.

Marial theology is much indebted to the work of Saint Andrew of Crete whose extant published work on Our Lady numbers 8 homilies and 2 canons. Father Jugie sums up his teaching in the following propositions : " I. The conception and birth of Mary were holy ; 2. she has a special title to be called daughter of God, θεόπα'. and God intervened in a particular way at the time of her conception; 3. she is the firstfruits of redeemed mankind and reflects in her person its pristine beauty; 4. her death was due to a different cause from that of other men... She died in order to resemble her Divine Son, to submit herself, as He did, to the plan of Providence, to strengthen faith in the Incarnation, to show in herself how the passage is made from corruption to incorruption " 4.

B) Liturgical books.

The books of the liturgical office at Byzantium finally took on a definite form as regards their essential elements in the vmth-ixth centuries. The *Proper of the Time* should he distinguished from the Proper of saints. The proper of the Time consists of :

λ) the Sunday offices (*Octoechos'*)s, attributed to St. John Damascene.

' In *Diet. Arch. loc. cit,* he gives a list of III *hirmi* some twenty *idiomela* and a dozen canons. Edit, in *P. G., 97,* 1305-1444. Cf. Greek liturgical books.

'The *canon* is a sung office divided into *odes,* that are themselves divided into troparia. More often than not the odes are lyrical only in name : their multiplication killed inspiration. — 3 *P. G.,* 97, 1329-13S6.

4 M. JUGIE, art. *ImmactiUe Conception,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 916-919.

s There are eight offices or canons for each of the *eight tones* (ήχο at that time meant tone or musical modulation). Hence the Οκτοηχο . All the week-day offices were on the same tone, the eight following each other regularly. When the series was ended it was recommenced : Lent and Eastertime however had special offices. This ordering of the ofiicc is still in use in the Greek Churcn.

the week-day offices *(Parakletike),* the work of Joseph the Hymnographer and his collaborators ;

special offices for Lent *(Triodiorì)* and Pascal time *(Pentecostarion*\ work of the Studites.

The PROPER OF SAINTS is found in an immense collection of one volume, the *Menaion:* it was formed from many and varied sources and was almost complete by the ixth century.

The early HYMNOGRAPHERS who, together with Saint Andrew of Crete, were most active in the formation of these liturgical books appear to be as follows :

1. St. John Damascene, who, although he was not entirely alone in composing the Octoechos, at least planned it and prepared the materials, says Father Pargoire'. He also composed other parts of the liturgy. See chap, vm, p. 326.

2. Cosmas the Hymnodist[3] companion and friend of St. John Damascene wrote a number of beautiful hymns, but the authenticity of all those bearing his name is not sure.

3. Joseph the Hymnographer (813-833) a monk of Constantinople, gave the final form to the *Paratilitekc* " with a total of 96 canons, of which 48 were his own, 32 signed *Theophanes* and 16 others "[4].

4. Joseph of Thessalonika[5] (762-832) together with his brother, Theodore of Studium, contributed largely to the Triodion.

5. Theodore of Studium[6] gave his name to the majority of the works of the monks of Studium, and undoubtedly wrote very many of them himself.

6. Theophanes Graptos[7] (d. 845) Archbishop of Nicea, is credited with 148 canons, but many are certainly due to others of the same name[8].

The poetess Cassia[9] (ixth cent.), is the centre of a charming legend, but the work attributed to her, though of great interest, is of very doubtful authenticity.

' The hymnographers continued their work even after the ixth century. See Em EREAU, *op. cit.* — 3 *L'Eglise byzantine,* p. 332.

3 *P. G.,* 98, 459-514· See C. Emereau, *op. cit.,* 1923. p. 20-22.

4 A *G.,* 105, 9S3-1426. Cf. J. Pargoire. *ibid.;* C. Emereau. *op. cit.,* 1923. p. 280-282.

5 See J. Pargoire in *Ech. d'Or.,* 1906-1907. C. Emereau. *ibid.,* 1923. p. 2S2 sq. — 6 See below.

7 See Emereau. *op. cit.,* 1925. p. 177-179 and 1926. p. 178. For the two brothers Grapti. see S. Va ïLHÉ. in *Rev. Or. chrit.,* 1901 (t. Vl). p. 313 sq., 610 sq. — 8 See J. Pargoire. *op. cit.,* p. 379-380.

9 See S. **PETRIDES, in** *Rev. Or. chrit.,* 1903 (t. vil), p. 218-244. Cf. Emereau, *op. cit.,* 1923, p. 14-16. r

CHAPTER VI.

Theologians of the Incarnation,

Special Bibliography: see the notes on each author.

I. LAST ADVERSARIES OF MONOPHYSITISM.

The vth Oecumenical Council did not put an end to the Monophysite controversies which continued even beyond the last years of the Vllth century. Though these quarrels gave rise to almost nothing original in theological thought, they at least opportunely restated the Catholic position, strengthened by the gradual disappearance of the heresies.

Eusebius of Thessalonica [1] Archbishop of that town in the time of Saint Gregory refuted an Aphthartodocetist monk, of whom the pope had advised him, in a long treatise in ten books, of which only Photius' summary is extant[2].

Eulogius of Alexandria, a priest of Antioch who became Patriarch of Alexandria about 580 (d. 607) was one of the most redoutable opponents of the heresy. Photius mentions a great many of his works against the Novatians[4] and the Severian, Theodosian and Gaianite Monophysites[5] as well as several treatises and parts of treatises *on the Trinity and the Incarnation of* which important elements survive[6]. All the remainder is lost save fragments[7] and a sermon for Palm Sunday[8].

Timotheus of Constantinople (beginning of the viith cent.), priest and administrator oí a church in that town, wrote a short work on the *reconciliation of heretics*: 91[0] he says that it is necessary to rebaptise many of them, particularly Gnostics, Manichaeans, Sabellians, and generally all who deny the Trinity, and even Pelagians (whom the author accuses of Manichaeism); others are only to be re-confirmed: Quartodecimans, Novatians, Arians, Apollinarists; lastly, Meletians, Nestorians, Monophysites and Euchites were to abjure their error, though the sacraments they had received were held to be valid

[1] See G. Baricille, *Ensebe de Th.*, in *Diet, théol.*, col. 1551-1553.
[2] *Epist.*, l. xi, 74. — [3] *Bibl*, cod. 162.
[4] *Bibl.*, cod. 182, 20S, 280. — [5] *Ibid.*, cod. 225, 226, 227.
[6] See O. Bardenhewer, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1896 (t. 88), p. 353-401; and *P. G.*, 86, 2939-2944. Cf. Photius, *Bibl.*, cod. 230.
[7] *P. G.*, 86, 2937-2964.
[8] *P. G.*, 86, 2913-2938.
[9] *De receptione hereticorum: P. G.*, 86, 11-74.
[10] See J. 'Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, Ill, p. 232-233.

Theodore of Raithu (vilth cent.), a monk of Sinai, has left a short work *De Incarnatione*[1] refuting Christological errors by explaining the true teaching. It is possible he wrote a treatise *De Sectis*[2].

Anastasios I of Antioch was also a monk of Sinai (hence the qualification *Sinaita,* sometimes given his name) before becoming Patriarch of Antioch from 549 to 570[3] and again from 593 to 599[4]. Four sermons of doubtful authenticity have been published under his name[5], but a number of authentic and valuable *theological opuscula* have been preserved, of which 5 are controversial treatises (in sermon form) on the Trinitarian and Christological question[6], and a summary of Christian Doctrine[7]. Yet this author's doctrinal authority was eclipsed by that of a simple monk, the veritable Anastasius Sinaita.

Anastasius Sinaita[8] (630-700), abbot of one of the monasteries on the Holy Mountain seems to have been one of the first theologians of his century. His vast work, unfortunately, has not yet been completely determined. Three works, however, must be attributed to him.

a) The *Guide* (or *Via dux adversus acephates*[9]) is a treatise in 24 chapters, against the principal Monophysite sects with which the author in person had striven in Egypt and Syria : the refutation contains much of speculative reasoning and the Peripatetic philosophy.

¿) The *Questions and Answers* give solutions based on the Scriptures and the Fathers, to various objections against the Faith[10]. The work in its present state contains interpolations.

r) The treatise on the *Hexaemeron*[11] is a collection of allegorical interpretations of the beginning of Genesis. The letter of the text, hardly taken into account by the exegete, is, according to him, a figure of Christ and the Church.

A fairly large number of *opuscula* are also attributed to him[12]. Several are certainly authentic. Especially deserving mention are :

[1] *P. C.*, 91, 1483-1504.

[2] (7., 86, 1193-1268 (among the works of Leontius Byzantinus). J. P. Junglas ascribes it to Theodore. A theological dissertation *De terminis philosophicis* appears to be lost.

[3] Justin it deposed him and put in his place another monk Gregory (570-593) some of whose sermons are extant *(P. G.*. 88, 1847-1886). This Gregory was the protector of Evagrius Scholasticus. Sec p. 281.

[4] He was restored at the request of St. Gregory the Great.

[5] *P. G.,* 89, 1361-1398. The fourth is certainly spurious, but to these should be added the sermon of enthronization of 593, edited by Pitra, *Juris Eccl. gr. hist.,* 1S68, π, p. 251-257. — [6] *P. G., ibid.,* 1309-1362 (only in Latin).

[7] *P. G., ibid.,* 1399-1404. Adda letter to Sergius and fragments. *Ibid.,* 14°5"I4OS. See also *Anastasius I,* Λ'. *Janin* in *Diet. Hist.,* col. 460.

[8] Editions : *P. G.,* 89. Pitra, *Juris...,* 11, 257-275. Studies : J. B. Kumpfmueller, *De Anastasio S.,* Wurzburg. 1865. SPACIL, *La teologia di S. Anasi. Sin.,* Rome, 1923 (ex *Possanone).* S. Vaii.HÉ, *AHast. le S.,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1167. R. JANIN, in *Diet. Hist.,* col. 1482-1483.

[9] *P- G.,* 89, 35-310. — [10] *P. G.,* 89, 329-824.

[11] *P. G.,* 89, 851-1078 (12 books : only the 12th is given also in Greek).

[12] *P. G.,* 89, 1077-1288; Pitra, *op. cit.;* F. Nau, in *Or. Christianus,* 1903, p. 56-98.

a prayer *for holy Communion*[1], and a short *History of the Heresies and the Synods*[3]. The authenticity of a valuable Patristic florilegnim entitled *Doctrina Patrum*[3], is less certain. Anastasius also seems to have been a poet and a funeral chant has been attributed to him[4],* with some probability.

The polemics of Anastasius were directed against Monophysitism, in one or another of its forms, rather than the error proper to the Vllth century, *Monothelitism*. This subtle heresy, which, with a pretence of conciliation renewed the error condemned at Chalcedon, must now be discussed in order to shew the Dart played by its two chief adversaries, St. Sophronius and St. Maximus.

II. CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES IN THE VIITH CENTURY.

A) Monothelitism.

I. The measures taken by Justinian [5], far from crushing the Monophysite opposition, led to a more settled organisation of the Jacobite Churches in Syria and Egypt. These Christian communities became so embittered against Byzantium, that in the reign of Heraclius (610-641), when the Empire was threatened by the Persians, and after 634 by the Arabs, it was feared they would ally themselves with the enemy [6].* In an endeavour to prevent this calamity the Patriarch Sergius, (610-638) more statesman than churchman [7], attempted to tighten the slipping bonds of empire by giving them a Catholicism in modified form, a kind of *via media* between heretical Monophysitism and Catholic duophysitism ; this was *Monothelitism,* a doctrine that proclaimed that there was but one will (or operation) in Christ[8].

1 *P. G., ibid.,* 825-850. — 2 Pitra, *op. cit.*
3 Ed. F. Diekamp, Munster im W., 1907.
4 E. Bouvy, *Echos d'Or.,* 1898, p. 262-264. Cf. S. Petrides, in *Rev. Or. chrlt.,* 1901, p. 444-452. — 5 See above, p. 82 sq.
6 See Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist, cone.,* in. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, 160-180. J. Pargoire, *HEglise byzantine,* p. 157-167. A. Ciiillet, *Le monothélisnie, exposé et critique,* Brignais, 1911.
7 Several of Sergius' *letters* survive in Mansi, *Condì.,* XI. The attribution of the *Acathistus* to Sergius is very doubtful. See above p. 291.
8 This teaching had already been put forward by Severus of Antioch (see above p. 68) and must have been openly taught in Alexandria about 600 when tne Patriarch Eulogius refuted it in his writing on the Trinity (See above p. 294). O. Bardenhewer, *op. cit.,* p. 372-374, 375. The intervention by Sergius gave a political importance to what seemed to be no more than a teaching of the schools.

Preliminary negotiations went on from 620 to 630, and with the raising of Cyrus, a devoted partisan of Sergius, to the Patriarchate of Alexandria, culminated in 633 in a common agreement of the whole of Egypt on a formulary of 9 anathematisms r. In the following year the Armenians also subscribed to the union (634) 2.

By 633 however, far-seeing Catholics had begun to protest against the concessions made by Sergius. This gave rise to a renewal of the Christological controversies| that was to last for 50 years, until the Sixth Council (680-681).

The chief events in this controversy were as follows :

a) Faced with the opposition of *Saint Sophronius,* Sergius thought it advisable to drop the expressions that had met with criticism. He succeeded in getting Pope Honorions (621-638) to confirm this stratagem quite unwittingly (causing the condemnation of the latter at the Vlth Council)3 and backed by this indirect approval, he composed and prevailed on Hcraclius to publish the *Ecthesis*,* a profession of faith of marked Monothelite tendencies (638). It was accepted apparently by the whole of the East.

¿)The *really serious opposition* then came from Rome : John iv (640-642) and Theodore I (642-649) were the leaders. Finally, Heraclius' successor, *Constans II* (641-648) suppressed the Ecthesis (648) and replaced it by the *Type}* a new edict forbidding the expressions 'one' or 'two' wills. The emperor enforced this law most cruelly for 20 years. Pope *Martin I* (649-653) who condemned it in the Council of Rome (649) was exiled, and with *Saint Maximus,* was one of the most illustrious victims of the persecution.

c} In the reign of *Constantine IV Pogonatus* (668-686) peace was gradually restored, especially by the election of Pope *St. Agatho* (678-681) who was able to make his authority felt and impose the true faith at the Vlth Council, held at Constantinople from November 7th 680 to September 16th 681. The council *in Trullo,* of course, is regarded by the East as the complement, as regards discipline, of the vth and vith Oecumenical Councils6.

2. Leaving to historians the duty of setting out the facts at greater length, we will endeavour to determine the

' Mansi, *Condi.,* xi, 564-568.

' This union of the Armenians with the Church of Byzantium was of brief duration. — 3 See below, p. 301 sq.

4 Text in Mansi, *Condi.,* x, 992-997. This edict frowned on the use of the expression *operation* ενέργεια and imposed that of will : " Εν θέλημα του Κυρίου ημών Ιησού Χριστού τού αληθινού θεού όμολογούμεν.

5 Text in Mansi, *Condi.,* x, 1029-1032. This new edict forbade the use of the word operation ένέργεια and the word *will* θέλημα, with the intention of putting an end to discussion and hindering the condemnation of the error.

6 See above, p. 280.

Monothelite doctrinal position, the better to grasp the ideas of those who defended the faith. The *nine Capitula of* [1] admitted the majority of the old Monophysite expressions and further, in the seventh, proposed what has been called *monenergism :* anathema to whomsoever denies " that there is but one Christ and Son working His Divine and His human works by *one theandric operation,* according to the divine Dionysius [2]; the elements that form the union are distinguished merely by the consideration of the mind and the discrimination of the understanding Thus, only a subjective intellectual distinction was recognised between the Divine and the human operation.

It would not seem that the Monothelites based the *theandric operation* of which they spoke, on the idea of a mixed nature, resulting from a confusion of the Divine and the human nature (strict Monophysitism)[3] [4] Many, however, took it to mean that in Christ there was but *one active principle,* the Word and the Divine nature; they looked on His human nature as more or less inert, lacking a life of its own, like a mere instrument, or the organs of a body wholly dependent on the soul [4] : its natural powers, unable to act, were as if they did not exist and possibly did not. This teaching, a kind of substitute for Monophysitism, has been termed Monenergism. It is not impossible that Sergius himself adopted this opinion at the outset, though we cannot be certain [5] of this on account of the vagueness of the word ἐνεργε'.α, which sometimes means energy or active principle of operation, and sometimes even ἐνεογεΓν, operation itself. Moreover, he soon apparently abandoned this expression in order to adopt one still more ambiguous and consequently more apt to his purpose.

b) The term will, θέλημα, seems to correspond best to Sergius' explanation of 634, contained in *his letter to Pope Honorius ;* this letter is a statement of Monothelitism in

1 Mansi, *Condì.,* xi, 564-568.
3 See above, p. 58.
3 See above p. 100 sq.
4 See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* Ill, p. 175-176.
5 Nor absolutely prove it.
6 Mansi, *Condi.,* xi, 529-537. See J. Tixeront, *ibid.,* p. 166-168. Cf. F. Amann, *Honorius I,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 99-101.

the true sense of the word ». Sergius gave his own version of the beginning of the controversy, and an abstract of his discussion with Sophronius and endeavoured to win the pope over to his idea of dropping the disputed expressions. He argued that it was only necessary to say " One Son of God, Our Lord Jesus Christ works the Divine and human works ". The expression ' one energy ', though found in the Fathers must be avoided since it shocks; but the expression " two energies " is new and dangerous, for it gives scandal by suggesting that in Christ there were two contrary wills, when in reality His human nature was perfectly moved, guided and ruled (κινοαμένη) by the Word and had adapted itself to the *Divine will* of the Word (θέλημα θεών). Finally, Sergius declared to Honorius, that though he was in favour of dropping the expressions, he had sent to the Emperor the letter of Mennas to Pope Vigilius containing the witness of the Fathers concerning the single energy and *single will* of Christ[2].

The carefully thought out terms of this letter, taken in conjunction with contempory historical events and the official confirmation of the Ecthesis leaves no doubt as to the error of Sergius. With the intention, or the pretence[3], of maintaining the moral (objective) unity of the will in Christ, he refused to admit in His humanity, " all spontaneity and all acts of free will[4]". The humanity of Christ is moved by the Divine will, not because of any act of its own, but through a kind of impetus received from the Word; it is Οεοκίνητο ; the human will is, as it were, non-existent. The natural powers are not expressly denied but it is asserted that their operation is bound up in some mechanical fashion to the will of the Word[5]. This doctrinal position was well calculated to attract the Monophysites who were always ready to lessen Christ's human nature; its danger lay in the fact that it was capable of upsetting the great work of the Council of Chalcedon, on a very important point.

[2] Is should be remarked that the expression ' *one τνιίΓ'* is insinuated rather than expressly stated by Sergius. It was Honorius, misled by Sergius, who actually used the expression.

[3] A letter that Sergius had already sent to Cyrus of Alexandria. This letter is considered spurious and was perhaps composed by Sergius. It was rejected by the legates to the Council of 680. Mansi, *Coito.* XI, 529, 532.

[3] It is possible that Sergius' political ambitions did not exclude a desire to remain traditionally orthodox.

[4] J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dog/η.,* in, p. 175.

[5] Since this operation of the Word on the humanity does not, of itself, pertain to the attributes of the personality, but to the nature, it may be said that Monolhelitism *subordinates* the human operations of Christ to the Divine nature and, by the medium of the latter, to the Person ; whereas according to orthodox theology the two natures possess their own distinct activity, both directly subject to the word. See]. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 172-174.

B) The Condemnation. Attitude of Honorius.

The answer of Honorius[1] "was that of an ill-informed, and what is more, an undiscerning man"[2][3] In his *first, letter*[3] (probably in 634) he approved the idea of dropping the expressions *one* and *two* operations and the stressing of the unity of the person from which derive two classes of activity. He added; "Wherefore we acknowledge *one Will* of our Lord Jesus Christ, since, to all appearances, the Divinity has taken our nature, though not the sin that is in it These last words make it clear that the pope, on Sergius' suggestion, wanted to exclude all human interference with the Divine will and it was evidently with this in mind that he approved the suggestions of the patriarch. Moreover, it is equally manifest that his approval was not given to Sergius' interpretation of the expressions, but to the pope's own reading of them. There is no doubt that Honorius *did 7101 perceive* all the implications of the Byzantine document. He had nevertheless agreed to passing over the new expressions *in silence* and that was why he was affronted by Sophronius' protests against the new theory and commanded him to abandon the expression "two energies". The account of these latter events is found in Honorius' *secoîid letter* to Sergius[4] (probably in 635) which again affirms the need of avoiding tie disputed expressions, but explicitly declares that each of the two natures possesses its own proper operation[5]. The pope nevertheless continued to reject the expression "two energies" which he had been led to believe dangerous[6].

These two letters had far-reaching results: they encouraged Sergius and lent support to Byzantine policy for the next forty years.

1 For all this question, see E. Amann, *Honorius* Z, in *Did. thiol.* 93-132 (very thorough study of the question).

3 J. Bois, *Constantinople (Hie cone, dej,* in *Did. thiol.*, col. 1262.

3 Mansi, *Condì..,* xi, 537-544: the original Latin is lost; the Greek text, though recognised as a good translation at the Council of 680, must not be taken too literally. *P. L.,* 40, 470-474. A translation out of the Greek.

4 Mansi, *Condi.,* xi, 577-581 *(P. L.,* 40, 474-475).

s "The two natures closely united in the unity of the one Christ, act and move into operation, each in union with the other, the Divine nature working what is of God, the human nature accomplishing the things of the flesh, without separation or confusion, and without the Divine nature being changed into the human, or the human into the divine".

6 Pope John iv explained Honorius' expression "one will" in the meaning that in *Christ's human* nature there did not exist two opposed tendencies, as there does in man on account of Original Sin *(P. L., 12S),* 561-566). This convenient commentary hardly seems justified by the context.

At the Council of 680 the Monothelites were still appealing to Honorius' authority. In this they were *mistaken,* as we have just seen. The documents in question have been regarded by some as purely private, but this opinion cannot be upheld : they must be considered rather as official pontifical documents, unimpeachable as regards their doctrinal content taken objectively, but extremely imprudent in their approval of the *policy of silence* as advocated by Sergius. Nor should it be forgotten that certain expressions that the pope might have avoided with a little more foresight [1], lent themselves to biased interpretation.

The Council of 680-681 *(Hird of Constantinople, VIth oecumenical)* condemned the Monothelite error in a dogmatic decree, repeating the text of Chalcedon on the *two natures* and adding that in Christ must also be admitted " two natural operations, undivided, unchanged, unshared and not confused", "two physical wills"[2]. This decree was read and approved at the XVIIth session and subscribed to at the XVUlth. The council had them lasted for ten months. The previous sessions had been devoted to an examination of the documents concerning the suspected teaching, the witness of the Fathers and the innovations of the heretics. The legates of Pope Agatho (678-681) presided, and no other oriental council had ever shewn such respect for the doctrinal authority of the Roman See[3]. It was the pope's intention that the charges were to be made against the old patriarch of Alexandria, Cyrus, and Sergius and Pyrrhus of Constantinople, in addition to Macarius the actual Patriarch of Antioch [4]. But when *Honorius'* letters to Sergius were read at the XHIth session, the council also condemned the old pope in these terms : " And in addition to these [5] we decide that Honorius also, who was pope of elder Rome, be with them cast out of the Holy Church of God, and be anathematized with them, because we have found by his letter to Sergius that he followed his opinion in *all things* and confirmed *his wicked dogmas"*[6]. In the last session he was again anathematized with the other heretics, " as having followed them in all these things "[7]. Honorius had in fact

1 Or simply by heeding the warnings sent to him by St. Sophronius before he wrote his second letter. In spite of his good intentions and orthodoxy, he merely succeeded in strengthening the heresy. This goes to explain the strictness of the Council of 680.

- Δύο φυσικά; ἐνεργεία ... δύο φυσικά θελήματά τε και ἐνεργεία . Denzinüer-B,, *Ettch.,* η. 2S9 292. Mansi, *Condì.,* χι, 635 sq.

3 Denzinger-B. *ibid.,* η. 288. — 4 See E. Amann, *op. cil.,* col. 112-113.

5 The heretics, Sergius, Cyrus etc. —

e Mansi, *Coital.,* xi, col. 556. — ? /ΛΖΛ, 665.

wholly approved the ban of silence suggested by Sergius, and as for the dogmas, although he had only explicitly confirmed the teaching, in itself excellent, of the objective and moral unity of the will in Christ, he nevertheless imprudently composed letters that the heretics were able to use against the traditional faith. This was enough to justify the anathemas and the expression of *heresy,* which, in the early Church, did not possess the precise modern sense of an *unrepentant adhesion* to a condemned doctrine and which was inflicted for less serious reasons[1].

It is not altogether exact, in spite of the contrary opinion, that the council distinguished between the case of Honorius and that of the other *heretics* condemned. The expressions that were used, however, admit a distinction, and the facts render it necessary. Pope Leo II (682-683), in his confirmation of the vith Council, which alone gives it Oecumenical rank, did not disclaim the measures taken against his predecessor[3], but he implied[3] that his guilt, though grave, was sensibly different from that of the others : " We anathematize the inventors of the new error,... and also Honorius who did not attempt to sanctify this Apostolic Church with the teaching of Apostolic tradition, but by profane treachery permitted its purity to be polluted"[4]. Honorius' fault lay in his grave negligence, as Leo II elsewhere explicitly declares[5], and though lhe pollution to which it gave rise was not the formal teaching of heresy, it was none the less exceedingly grave, a pollution of the immaculate Church, since the writings of Honorius, had, *in fact,* helped to spread the error[6].

III. SAINT SOPHRONIUS OF JERUSALEM[7].

Saint Sophronius of Jerusalem is noteworthy for having been the first to denounce Monothelitism. Modern critics generally identify Sophronius the Sophist of whom Moschus

[1] See E. Amann, *op. cit.,* col. 117-119.

[3] It is an exaggeration to see any *contradiction* between the letter of Pope Leo I and the conciliary text.

[3] This was all the pope could do in the circumstances ; the general good obliged him to be conciliatory. These circumstances, far from diminishing the implications contained in the text of his confirmation, give them greater importance.

[4] Mansi, *Concit.,* xi, col. 733.

[5] Letter to the Spanish Bishops. Mansi, *Concit.,* XI, col. 1050.

[6] See E. Amann, *op. cit.,* col. 123-132, on the vast amount of literature dealing with the case of Honorius.

[7] Edition : *P.* G., 87, 3147-4104. Studies : S. Vailhé, *Sophrone le Sophiste et Sophrone le Patriarche,* in *Rev. or. chrét.,* 1902, p. 360-385; 1903, p. 32-69 and 356-387. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* ni, p. 164-166. E. Amann, *Honorius I,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 105 sq. E. Bouvy, *Poètes et tnilodes,* p. 169-182. P. EmEREAU, *Hymnographi Byz., op. cit.,* 1925, p. 173.

speaks in various chapters of his *Spiritual Meadow* \ with Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who attacked the new error. This identification supplies the only source for Sophronius' life before his episcopal consecration. Father Vailhé who has written considerably on this author, admits this identification and outlines as follows the chief events in his career2. Born at Damascus about 550, he taught rhetoric for some time and while still young became a monk in Palestine. In 578 accompanied by Moschus he began a number of journeys to the East ; Egypt, Sinai, Palestine, Northern Syria. Finally, about 604 he settled with his companion in Alexandria where he became an intimate of the patriarchs, especially John the Almsgiver. In 615 the two friends arrived in Rome, were Moschus died in 619. His remains were brought back to Palestine by Sophronius who appears to have remained there until he became Patriarch of Jerusalem in 634.

Sophronius was not only a friend of Moschus but also his collaborator. After 619 he published his *Spiritual Meadow*3 and completed his *Life of St John the Almsgiver*4. He himself was no mean hagiographer. He had already written before 610, the *Life of St. Mary the Egyptian*5, the famous penitent and shortly afterwards composed a long work on the Egyptian martyrs, *Cyrus* and *John* who were greatly venerated at Alexandria and to whom he owed the preservation of his sight. This work (about 510) contains an eulogy of the saints and an account of 70 miracles obtained by their intercession 6.

St. Sophronius also wrote poetry in the ancient meter, notably *23 anacreontic odes*7 (i. e., in imitation of Anacreon's meter, but not, obviously, the latter's frivolous themes). Though this verse was composed for Church feasts, it was never used liturgically. Only a few simpler pieces found a place in the offices (for Christmas, Epiphany, Good Friday). He did not compose the *Triodion*,* not does he seem to have contributed to it.

Of greater importance are his pastoral works, comprising :

*a) 10 homilies*8 of which three at least were written when he was bishop; the majority were preached on the feasts of Our Lord, Our Lady and the Saints. The homily on the Annunciation is very exact in its Christological teaching.

1 *Spirit. Mead.,* ch. 21, 69, 92, 102, 106, 157, 162.

2 *Op. cit.,* 1903, p. 368-369. — 3 See above p. 283.

4 Lost save possible fragments in Melaphrastes : *P. G.,* 114, S96 sq.

5 *P. G.,* 87, 3697-3726. See P. Delmas, in *Echos d'Orient,* 1901 and 1902 (2 articles).

P. G., 87, 3379*3424 (life), 3423*3676 (miracles). The two following lives, edited *ibid.* (3677-3696) are not authentic. The life of 5. *Anastasius (P. G.,* 92, 1679-1730) is ascribed to him by several authors. — *1 P. G* 87 V33-38-?8

8 See above, p. 294. — 9 *p. G.,* 87, 3201-3364 and 4001-4004.

b) two *disciplinary writings* (on the confession of sins[1] and the baptism of the Apostles) (fragments)[2].

c) lastly, two writings in which he combats Monothelitism : the *synodal letter of enthronization*[3] (634) and the *collection of Patristic texts* (about 600) in two books, that were sent together with this letter to Honorius. This collection is unfortunately no longer extant.

Saint Sophronius, still a simple monk, was in Egypt with his friend Maximus when the union of 633 was accomplished. He at once realised its danger and tried in vain to bring Cyrus back to orthodoxy. He also made a fruitless journey to Constantinople in order to convert Sergius. On his return to Jerusalem in 634 he was elected Patriarch[4] and ceasing to beseech and argue, made an authoritative pronouncement in the synod. He unequivocally condemned the new ideas in his *letter of enthronization* and threw a cold clear light on a question that diplomatic bishops were endeavouring to confuse. The letter was sent to the Oriental patriarchs and the Pope, to whom also were submitted the Patristic texts mentioned above. Honorius, however, had already been prejudiced against Sophronius by Sergius, and instead of making good use of his information, asked the Bishop of Jerusalem to abandon his opposition[5]. In spite of his age Sophronius would have gone himself to opeii the Pope's eyes to the gravity of the affair — a gravity he did not fully realise — if the coming of the Arabs had not forced him to remain at the post of danger in his diocese. The Holy City was besieged about 635-636; Sophronius helped in the defence and finally negotiated its surrender with Omar. In exchange for an annual tribute he obtained civil and religious liberty for the Christians[6]. He scarcely survived this disaster and died in 638.

The Christological doctrine of St. Sophronius is to be found in his sermons, but more especially in the *letter of enthronization*. which constitutes a highly valuable theological document. " After a very precise and complete explanation of the dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation, it enters upon the question by clearly stating a *principle* which alone can provide a satisfactory solution : Christ is *one* and *two*. εν καὶ δύο; He is *one* with regard to the hypostasis and the

1 *P. G.*. 87, 3365-3372.
2 *Ibid.*. 87, 3371-3372 and 92, 1075-1078. Similar legend in MOSCHUS, *Spirit. Mead.. 176.* See below. Cf Clement Al., *Hypotyposes.* v.
3 *P. G.*. 87, 3147-3200. — 4 See S. Vailhé, *op. cit.*. 1903, p. 32, sq.
5 See above p. 301. — 6 S. Vailhé, *op. cit.*. p. 65-66.

person; He is *two* in regard to the natures and their respective attributes. He naturally perforins the works of each nature, in conformity with the quality proper to each and its essential attributes. The same person accomplished the Divine and the human works, but by means of *distinct principles,* for each of the two natures were preserved intact without any admixture of the active powers. — On this solid basis Sophronius was able to build up fearlessly the theory of *two operations* in Christ; to its development he devoted a large part of the synodal letter. It should be remarked that the question of *two wills* was not even raised ;" [1] but this was solely because the controversy had not as yet broken out in this direction. It would be rash to conclude from this that Sophronius admitted, in addition to two distinct physical operations, only one hypostatic will [2] The council of 680 adopted Saint Sophronius' teaching, and because of the controversies that came after the saint's death, added to the expression "two physical energies", that of " two physical wills ".

Saint Sophronius was truly great in his role of doctor and defender of the traditional faith. It required a rare intelligence to bring to light the ambiguities of Sergius. He was nevertheless surpassed by St. Maximus, who was perhaps the better philosopher. Some have found his *style* too emphatic and verbose, but his verse, often classical in its purity, has always had its admirers [3].

IV. SAINT MAXIMUS THE CONFESSOR[4].

A) The Confessor or Martyr, and Theologian.

By his vigorous resistance to Byzantine court theology, St. Maximus merited the title of *confessor.* His outstanding

Fols, *Constantinople (IIIe Cone, de),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col, 1262-1263. See E. Amann, *op. cit.* —[1] See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 166.

[3] See E. Bouvy, *op. cit.* S. Vailhé, *op. cit.,* 1903, p. 383-384.

[4] Editions : *I\ G., go-gi* (Combefis* edit., 1675) and *P. G.,* 4 (29-576, on Dionysius the Areopagite). Studies : V. Grumel, *Notes d'histoire et de chronologie sur la vie de saint Maxime le Confesseur,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1927 (t. 26), p. 24-32; *Maxime de Chrysopolis* or *Max. le Confesseur (saint)* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 448-459. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* ni, chiefly p. 188-192. II. Straubinger, *Die christologie des hl. Maximus Conf.,* Bonn, 1906. P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrét.,* 1, p. 474-477. A- Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 67-76. J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise byz.,* chiefly p. 240-245. L. Duchesne, *L'Eglise au l·Ie siècle,* Taris, 1926, p. 431 sq. R. Devreese, *La vie de* Ó. *Maxime,* in *Anal, bolland.,* 1928, p. 5.49.

intelligence would equally justify the title of *theologian,* while the number and depth of his works on spirituality make of him one of the chief *mystical authors* of the Orient.

A *Vita sancti Maximi,* in spite of its defects and eulogistic style, provides us with valuable information on his life [*]. He was born at Constantinople about 580, to a highly placed Christian family. He accepted a governmental post and in the reign of Heraclius had become first Imperial secretary. But he soon grew tired of worldly honours and about 613 withdrew to a monastery of Chrysopolis (Scutari). It is scarcely probable that he was abbot [2] God had sent him providentially to His Church as defender of the faith against the Monothelite heresy, whose first eruptions he had witnessed in Egypt in 633 where he was staying together with St. Sophronius at the time of the celebrated union. Under Constans II *he was one of the most outstanding representatives of the Catholic opposition.* By his letters he spread light and encouragement. He does not appear, however, to have returned to Constantinople [3] at this period. He remained for a long time in Latin Africa where his example led to a firm stand being made against Monothelitism. At Carthage he held a public controversy with *Pyrrhus,* Sergius' successor to the See of Byzantium from 639 to 641, who was dethroned, and forced to fly for political reasons. Maximus convinced his adversary, who became a Catholic. The verbatim report of the meeting [4], written by St. Maximus, is still extant; it constitutes a first class dogmatic document concerning the controversy. Pyrrhus went to Rome with St. Maximus to make his retractation (646 or 647) but soon recanted and was excommunicated. At Rome, St. Maximus joined even more ardently in the struggle for the defence of the true faith. He played an important part in the council of 649 [5]. Following the Roman method, he compiled a collection of Patristic texts on Monothelitism, though it was less developed than that

[*] See *P. G.,* 90, 67-110. We have adopted in this account the corrections of the traditional chronology made by Fr. Grumel in his recent study *(Echos d'Orient).*

[3] Early writers gave him this quality, but it was only a title of respect.

[3] He had left his monastery in Asia Minor at the time of the Persian invasion.

[4] *Disputatio cum Pyrrho: P. G.,* 91, 287-354.

[5] St. Maximus' very explicit teaching on the authority of the Apostolic See should here be recalled. Sec also on this point V. GRUMEL in the *Union des Eglises,* 1927, p. 295-311.

of the Latins. He concentrated on the philosophical angle, endeavouring to solve the intellectual difficulties, whose importance he realised better than others. This is evident from a study of his *theological* and *polemical opuscula,* usually aimed at Monophysitism or Monothelitism. The date of their composition is not definitely fixed. His indisputable influence explains why the Oriental heretics attacked him tooth and nail. In 653, he was seized at Rome, a town dependent on Byzantium, and carried off by force to Constantinople. Refusing to subscribe to the *Type,* he was exiled (655), together with two of his friends and disciples, *Anastasias the Apocrisarius* and *Anastasius the Monk*[1]. The report of the trial is extant[2]. Seven years later the three confessors of the faith again appeared before the praetor. As they still remained steadfast in their faith, they were, it is said, condemned to be scourged and their tongues and hands cut off. They were certainly exiled to the Causasus, in the country of the Lazes. Maximus soon died from his sufferings (August 13th 662).

Saint Maximus was a fine theologian. His favourite *masters* seem to have been *St. Gregory Nazianzen,* whose profounder passages he explained at length[3] and *Dionysius the Areopagite,* whom he took to be the disciple of St. Paul and whom he greatly admired. His were the commentaries that introduced Dionysius to Catholic readers[4], and his wide knowledge of Platonism was due at least to this author. He was also well acquainted with the works of Aristotle whose phraseology and definitions he frequently used. He was as exact and as rigorous as a schoolman and it is to be regretted that he never gave any methodical arrangement of his teaching in one great work. We will do no more than mention his *De anima*[5], an anthropological essay, his "theology" containing the above-mentioned commentaries on Gregory and Dionysius and also a short treatise on the *Procession of the Holy Ghost*[6]. Some account of his Christology, however, must be given here.

[1] Anastasius the apocrisarius has left a letter and a collection of texts and anti-Monothelite syllogisms (*P. G.*, 90,173-194). Two letters of Anastasius the monk are extant (*Ibid.*, 133-136). — [3] *P. G.*, 90, 135-170.

[3] *P. G.*, 91, 1061-1418.

[4] Published with the works of *Dionysius the Areopagite,* in *P. G.*, 4, 15-432, 527-576. See also Maximus' other writing, *Ambiguorum liber (De Dionysio et Gregorio), P. C.*, 91, 1031-1060.

[5] *P. G.*, 91, 353-362. — [6] Among the opuscula, *P. G.*, 91, 133-138.

St. Maximus' works on Christ are particularly important : they are the *Argument with Pyrrhus*^ the *theological opuscula* we have just mentioned, and his *letters.*

Among the 45 extant letters ' of St. Maximus, several constitute veritable theological works both on account of their length and their manner of dealing with the questions under discussion, e. g., letters 12-15. Letters 2 (on charity), 4 (God-given sadness), are especially interesting from an ascetic viewpoint. All manifest the solid virtue and enlightened piety of the holy monk.

The theological and controversial Opuscula [1] are a collection of short studies on controverted points between Catholics and Monophysites or Monothelites. The whole is preceded by an obviously authentic preface to the priest Marinus and accompanied by scolia added later. All these writings deal either directly or indirectly with Christological questions and many of them are perfectly didactic in method.

His Christological teaching [3] is especially noteworthy whenever it touches on points which divided Catholics and Monothelites at that time. It may be centred around two ideas which gave rise to dispute; the idea of operation and that of will.

a) The operation (ενέργεια) is essentially proper to the nature which is its immediate and necessary source [4]. Although the person may afford some particular and nobler moral value to the action, it is never its physical source or principle; this is the attribute of the nature. It follows that each nature possesses its proper operation, and Christ, Who has two natures, must also possess two entirely complete and distinct operations and activities: To make of Christ's humanity no more than an instrument of the Word is to profess Apollinarianism or Nestorianism[5]. St. Maximus then solves the objections drawn from the Fathers. St. Cyril certainly spoke of a single operation, but he was referring to a single action to which both the natures of Christ had contributed; a miracle worked by the power of the Word with the aid of His human nature[6]. As for the *theandric operation* of which Dionysius speaks (θεανδρική ἐνε'ργεια) Maximus takes it to mean either the harmony that united the two natures by reason of their circumincession or co-penetration (περι/ώρησι), or their simultaneous collaboration in one single work, as does St. Cyril[7].

1 *P. G.,* 91, 363-650.

2 *P. G.,* 91, 9-286 *(Opuscula theologica el polemica ad Maximum).*

3 See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogni.,* ni, p. 188-192.

4 Were the operation to be ascribed directly to the person, it would be necessary to distinguish three operations in God, which is evidently heretical. *Disputatio cum Pyrrho* (beginning) : *P. G.,* 91, 64.

5 See *Opuse, theol.; P. G.,* 91, 64.

6 Qua (operatione) non solo jussu... divina signa incorporea ratione patrabat,... sed quod etiam contactu suæ carnis hæc corporaliter ederet. *Disp. cum Pyrrho; P. G.,* 91, 344-345. — 7 *Ibid.*

¿) As regards the will (Οέλησι . θέλημα) St. Maximus admits in the human nature of Christ, the θέλημα φυσικόν i. e., the power of willing the very act oí the will and of willing freely, as is proper to reasoning nature. But he denies the θέλημα γνωμικον, i. e., the determination, the approval and the choice of the thing willed *, either because that implies a previous consideration, a kind of hesitancy deriving from an *imperfect intellectual grasp* of the object, or because it supposes a *first movement* which, in the East, is especially attributed to the person Moreover, he had no need to fear any strife, as the heretics claimed, between the physical human will (natural) and the Divine Will, since there is only one who "wills", one who "operates"; the Incarnate Word : the human nature conforms to the Divine will by means of a free, spontaneous act.

Instead of "a kind of mechanical concept" 4 of the union, Maximus proposes a more genial idea, according to which the *moral harmony* of the human nature and the Divine nature entails rather than eliminates a physical duality. The latter, in its turn, throws into stronger relief the wealth of this moral harmony of the two wills; it causes Christ to become for us a less distant model; a model whom Maximus, an ascetic and mystic as well as theologian, calls on his disciples to imitate in their life as Christians.

B) Ascetic and Mystic.

Even should we neglect the various and extremely doubtful collections published under the name of St. Maximus, his work on spirituality still remains considerable. In the first rank of this work we would place several of his writings on the Scriptures.

I. His scriptural works comprise, in addition to a " Brief chronology of the life of Christ" s, a great work dedicated to his friend *Thalassius,* monk and abbot. It contains the replies of Maximus to 65 questions on the Scriptures, put to him by Thalassius6. The author's explanations reveal a marked preference for the spiritual and anagogica! sense, thus revealing the aspirations of his contemplative soul. The opusculum *To Theopemptes*l answers three difficulties on verses of the Gospels, proposed by this lawyer. Of greater importance from an exegetical and particularly a spiritual standpoint are the two

* *Opuse. theol.,* beginning; etc. St. Maximus makes very subtle and somewhat complex distinctions, later copied by St. John Demasccne. See M. Jugie, *S. Jean Dani.,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 7Σ3 and 734 sq·

2 See M. Jugie, *ibid.,*

3 *Opuse, theol.,* Disp, cum severianis ; *P. G.,* 91, 30 sq.

* J. T1XERONT, *op. cit.,* I92.

5 Edited by Br a TKE, in *Zeitsch. fur Kirchcnp.,* 1892 (Xlll) p. 382-3S4.

6 *Quastiones ad Thalassium de Scriptura: P. G.,* 90, 243-786. The scholia are from another hand. The abbot Thalassius was the author of an ascetic collection : *P. G.,* 91, 1427-144T. — *I P. G.,* 90, 1393-1400.

treatises devoted to the explanation of Psalm 59 *{Deus repulisti nos et destruxisti nos}* and of the *Pater*[1]. This latter commentary marks an advance on those of earlier writers by its evident theological and moral treatment[3] Maximus judges that the objects of the seven petitions are I. the knowledge of God (theology) ; 2. Divine adoption; 3. assimilation to the angels; 4. life in God; 5. correction of nature by grace; 6. destruction of the law of sin ; 7. defeat of the devil.

2. The principal ascetic works, in the proper sense of the word, are, for the moment[4],* as follows :

a) The *Liber asceticus**, a dialogue between an abbot and a young monk on the duties of the religious life. This is regarded as a masterpiece, both for its clear and simple style, and the wisdom of its teaching·.

b) The *Capita de caritate** contains, under 400 heads *{capita},* a concise but substantial spiritual, ascetic and mystical doctrine representing the full perfection of charity.

c) The *200 Capita theologica et oeconomica* and the *Capita alia* (or *243 capitdy*[1] are very similar to the preceding in matter and style.

Other similar collections attributed to St. Maximus are less well authenticated [8].

3. Mystical works, in the original sense of the term[9], are represented both by St. Maximus' commentaries of Dionysius the Areopagite and his *Mystagogy*[10] which was also inspired by the same author; in the course of 24 chapters he proposes various symbols enabling the soul to rise to God, drawn particularly from the Church and its rites, just as Dionysius had done in his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy n. Maximus imitates Dionysius, though with a large admixture of his own ideas, after having restated the Areopagite's teaching on affirmative and negative theology. A mystical explanation of Christian feasts and chronology *(computus ecclesiasticus)* [11], is written in the same manner.

[1] *P. G.*, 90, 855-872.—[3] *Ibid,* 871-910.—[3] See vol. I, p. 192, 231, 257,417,684.

[4] Until the authenticity of the writings mentioned in note 8 is determined.

[5] *P. G.*, 90, 911-956. —[6] *Ibid.*, 959-1080.

[7] *Ibid.*, 1083-1176 (2 centuries); 1410-1462 (cap. 243).

[8] These are: the *Diversa capita* (5 cent.): *P. G.*, 90, 1177-1392. On this collection, see M. Soppa, Dresden, 1922, Cf. *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1924 (t. XX), p. 126-127. The *Loci communes,* (ZJ. *G.*, 91, 721-1018) are still more dubious. Nor is it yet proved that Maximus composed the *Capitula de temperantia* (*P. G.*, 65, 1053-1070) ascribed to Mark the Hermit. See Vol. I, p. 50S. Until the origins of such documents are soundly established, they cannot be used prudently in doctrinal studies. As regards the authenticity of the 5 spiritual centuries *{Capitula diversa}* see a sound critical study by Fr. Marie-Theophane DispiER, in *Echos d'Orient,* 1931, p. 160-171. This author, however, does not admit that Maximus composed the *Capita alia,* but attributes them to Elias Ecdikos (a monk of the Xlth or Xiith cent.), *Echos d'Orient,* 1932, p. 17-43. ΘΠΓ doctrinal outline is based chiefly on other writings.

[9] Sec vol. I, p. 19, for the modern meaning of the word mystic. For the ancient meaning see above p. 95 sq. Early writers usually applied this word to a knowledge of God *(theology),* that could be either infused or symbolical; the symbol rendered the idea of God more concrete. See vol I, p. 22-23 a*id above, p. 662. —[10] *P. G.*, 91, 657-718. — [11] See above, p. 89.

[12] *P. G.*, 19, 1217-1280 (among Eusebius works). Ihree hymns are also ascribed to St. Maximus: *P. G., 91,* 1417*1424·

The spiritual teaching of St. Maximus was a splendid echo of traditional doctrine : that he had read and meditated the works of the early writers, he himself declares to Elpidius at the beginning of the *Capita de caritate*[1]. The Areopagite influenced him profoundly, though far from exclusively. His teaching seems to be especially outstanding for the place it gives to the Saviour, Whose mysteries formed the especial object of his contemplation when he defended the integrity of His human nature. Like Dionysius[2], he taught that we are *deified* by grace[3] (θέωσι) but he stressed more markedly the action of Christ.

Christ is not only the meritorious cause of our salvation but also the *exemplary cause :* He is the ideal model of our deification since His human will, though physically distinct from the Divine Will, was perfectly subject to the Word, thus effecting a complete moral union with God. Hence the great law of Christian life is the *imitation of Christ,* especially in the religious life, as Maximus declares at the beginning of the *Liber Ascéticas*[4] in which this theme is *finely and strongly developed :* the imitation of Christ is the rule in the struggle against the enemies of the soul, the rule of prayer and contemplation, the rule of all virtue, and especially of charity.

In St. Maximus' ascetic teaching much is said of self-love (φιλαυτία)[5] which would seem to embody all those evil tendencies that the early monks divided into 8 classes. These obstacles to perfection arising from concupiscence are aggravated by the influence of evil spirits; yet the Christian, imitating Christ, can always overcome these *temptations* by watching, patience and prayer[6]. These efforts, with the aid of grace, will bring the soul to a state of *interior peace (animi tranquillitas,* απάθεια)[7], restraining concupiscence and consisting in a kind of "return to the integrity of nature which is no longer tempted interiorly by any impurity or any allurement of vice": this expression is used by Maximus[8] when speaking of the effects of *prayer*

1 *Cap. de car.,* Prolog. — 3 *Cæl. hier.,* I, 3; *Eccl. hier.,* I, 3.

3 *Exp. orationis dominica,* first petitions; *Opuse, theol.,* first op. to Marinus end (theological explanation of divinisation). — 4 *Liber, asc.,* 3.

5 *Quast. ad Thalass.,* Prolog.; *Cap. de car., u,* 9; m, 7, 8, 18, 20, 56, 57, etc

6 *Liber asc.,* 13-25. See also *Exp. orat. doni,* (last petitions).

7 Απάθεια ; *Cap. de car.,* I, 36; IV, 13, 92. *Cap. alia,* 71, 72, 121, etc

8 *Exp. orai. doni.*

and grace. *Prayer,* which, together with fasting and silence[1], is one of the great forces of the soni, implies the avoidance of distractions and application to pious thoughts : this is the way into the sanctuary; but the prayer of silence alone opens the holy of holies[2]; and that is the prayer of the perfect.

The faithful form three classes : the *beginners* who are still led by fear *(servi); those who advance...* attracted by promised rewards *(mercenarii);* lastly the *perfect,* who are guided by the purest feelings of filial piety *(filii)*[3]. These perfect ones possess that interior peace, the goal of the ascetic, of which we have just written. In their prayer they also receive an even greater illumination which leads them into the realms

contemplation of which Maximus often speaks, notably at the end of his first book *De caritate*[4], and at the end of *Capita alia*[5]. This illumination is often compared to wisdom, one of the gifts of the Holy Ghost that the author calls the "eyes of the faith"[6]; by them also is brought to the soul that knowledge of God or "theology" which isa fruit of prayer[7]. But the most precious of the gifts of the perfect, that which is supposed by and perfects all the others, is *charity*[8]. Charity truly *deifies* the soul by giving it those sentiments that adoptive sonship implies, by uniting it morally to God so closely that it merits the title of spouse[9]. All these gifts come from *Christ*™. The Saviour dwells by faith in souls bringing with Him all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. The many Christians who do not find him, must blame their own neglect n.

x *Alia cap.,* 24. —a *Ibid.,* 102, 180-182.

3 *Mystagogia,* c. XIV.

4 *Cap. de car.,* I, 86-100, where he draws on Dionysius and Gregory the Great. Cf. *ibid.,* IV, 79 sq. — 5 *Capita alia,* 141 and sq. *(passim).*

6 *Ad Thalass.,* qu. 44. Cf. *Capita de car.,* 69.

7 See above, *Expos, orat. dom.*

8 See chiefly the *Cap. de car.,* the *Liber asc.,* and *letter IV.*

9 *Capita alia,* 171. —10 *Cap. de car.,* IV, 77. — " *Ibid.,* iv, 69-72.

CHAPTER VII.

The defenders of the worship of images in the East.

Last orators and theologians.

SPECIAL bibliography : see the notes for each author.

I.—THE LAST OF THE GREEK ORATORS.

Eloquence was bound to suffer a decline after the passing of such orators as St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, St. Gregor}' of Nyssa and particularly St. John Chrysostom. Talking and preaching, of course, did not come completely to an end in Constantinople. On the contrary, perhaps, an only too evident straining after fine speaking was made, and this effort proved a great setback to naturalness in the pulpit, liveliness of style, the moral effect of sermons, and true eloquence. The great doctors we have just mentioned and particularly the last two, were everywhere imitated. But the fluency of Chrysostom, a result of his inexhaustible wealth of thought and feeling, gave rise, in less gifted orators, to an exaggerated taste for verbosity, sometimes to the detriment of their matter. The rhetoric of Gregory of Nyssa, on the other hand, was not altogether free of the pompous and affected manner which seems to characterise Byzantine preaching. Sacred oratory, weakened by its choice of dogmatic and speculative subjects in preference to moral and practical questions, was not always strengthened by the soundness and depth of rational demonstration. The latter was more often verbal than real, and several orators substituted brilliant imagery and an accumulation of antitheses for convincing and reasonable arguments. These defects which are to be found chiefly in the last centuries of the period now being studied I do not, however, prevent

* See St. Cyril of Alexandria, p. 43» 'I heodoret, p. 25 and their contemporaries p. 104.

Greek oratorical works from possessing a very real importance from a doctrinal viewpoint. They provide vast sources of sure theological doctrines, notably Marial theology L

The majority of the orators of this epoch were theologians better known for their actions than for their eloquence : these, in addition to Ó7. *Andrew of Crete* who was chiefly a poet, are *St. Sophronius* of Jerusalem, the denouncer of Monothelitism, *St. Germanus* of Constantinople, the first adversary of Iconoclasm, and two famous monks, *St.John Damascene* and *St. Theodore of Studium.* They are treated elsewhere2. A number of authors who wrote interesting sermons on various subjects are mentioned below.

John of Thessalonika3, Bishop of that town in the first half of the seventh century4, is best known for a series of sermons on St. Demetrius5, the patron of Thessalonika. There is also extant a homily6 on the agreement of the Evangelists concerning the Resurrection, which formed part of a series of evangelical homilies, and also another homily on the *Dormition,* which, with the exception of the apocrypha7, is "the first detailed account we possess of the ancient Greek tradition of the Dormition of the Blessed Virgin"8.

Modestus of Jerusalem (d. 634), St. Sophronius' predecessor, in addition to oratorical fragments 9 }ias left no more than a long and verbose sermon on the *Dormition of the Blessed Virgin'*0, in which the tradition in Jerusalem at the beginning of the vnth century regarding the tomb of Mary is clearly affirmed

The hagiographer, Leontius of Neapolis la, is also regarded as the author of four sermons, but their authenticity has not been definitively determined 13

* See M. Jugie, *Immaculée Conception,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. S93-924; and various articles in *Echos d'Orient.*

2 See chaps v, vi, vm and XI.

3 M. Jugie, *Vie et oeuvres de Jean de Thess.,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1922 (t. 21), p. 293-307; *Jean de Thess.,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 819-825; *Homélies mariales byzantines,* x, in *O.,* 19, 344-349 (general introduction), 349-374 (special introd, to the homily on the Dormition), 375-438 (text, and trans.).

4 Rather than the end of the century, as was thought for a long time. See Jugie, *Ibid.*

5 These form the first book of the *Acts of St. Demetrius, P. G.,* 96, 1203-1324. They tell chiefly of his miracles.

6 *P. G.,* 59, 635-644, among Chrysostom's *spuria;* others probably are his, *ibid.*

7 *De Transitu Maria.* See vol. I, p. 162. Cf. Jugie, *Echos dl Orient,* 1926, p. 300 sq.

8 M. Jugie, *op. cit., P. O.,* 19, p. 349. See note 11.

9 I'HOTIUS, *Bibl.,* cod. 275. Texts in *P. G.,* 86, 3273-3278.

«° *P. G.,* 86, 3277-3312.

" This tradition did not exist at Jerusalem in the time of St. Epiphamus, nor at the beginning of the vith century. See M. Jugie, *La mort et l'Assomption de la Ste Vierge dans la tradition des cinq premiers siècles,* in *Echos dl Orient,* 1926, p. 138 sq., 284 sq.

»' See above p. 284.

'3 One of these sermons deals with images : *Contra pídaos et de imaginibus.*

Bishop John of Eubaea (d., about 750) was the author of a sermon on the Holy Innocents[2] and another very long homily on the *Conception of Mary*[3], in which, says Fr. Jugie[3], the original sinlessness of the Mother of God is stated with sufficient clearness.

II. — THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES IN THE VUIth CENTURY.

A) The worship of images[4].

The veneration of images must not be confused with their *use.* Images can be used either as ornaments to the church, or as a means of instructing the people, or as a stimulus to piety. This threefold utility is evident. Their veneration goes farther than this and implies the exterior *homage* given to these objects. The Iconoclasts sometimes protested against the *use* of images; they always opposed their veneration. The defenders of the faith energetically maintained it, though they recognised that is was not an essential part of religion. This controversy in reality was but the excuse for attacking all religion. The Church was in peaceful possession of a universally received practice that had a certain doctrinal importance. When it was attacked, the Church was accused of idolatry and with corrupting the faith. Many Oriental bishops, in spite of the warnings of St. Germanus, did not realise the implications of the question and it is this that caused the almost general defection at Hieria (753). The true defenders of the traditional faith in this long and laborious struggle were the monks and the popes.

The use and the veneration of images was widespread in the first seven centuries of the Church[5]; a few isolated voices had been raised in feeble protest on the occasion, or pretext, of real or possible abuses. Monophysitism by its tendency to merge Christ's human nature in His Divine nature had accentuated this sparse opposition. But the Iconoclast crisis was really brought about by forces alien to

[1] *P. G.,* 96, 1501-1508.

[2] *Senno in Conceptionem Deipara; P. G.,* 96, 1459-1500.

[3] *Imm. Concept.*, in *Did. thiol.,* col. 921-922.

[4] See chiefly J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Dogm.,* in, p. 435-483. C. EMEREAU, *Iconoclasmo,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 575*595· V. Grumel, *Images (Culte des),* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 766-844. These articles possess very complete bibliographies.

[5] See J. Tixeront, *op. cit.;* p. 435*454-

Christianity [1]. We can instance the pressure of the Jews, hostile to all representation of the human countenance, and the various sects of the Empire (Paulicians, Manichaeans, etc.). The Mohammedans increased these tendencies from without. *All these converging influences** explain the new policy adopted by the founder of the Isaurian dynasty who decided to re-organise the Empire from a religious standpoint as he had vigorously and cleverly done from an administrative and political point of view. In reality his religious policy, far from uniting the Empire, only succeeded in causing disruptions for nearly 120 years, from 725 until 842.

B) Iconoclasm.

It is usual to distinguish in the history of Iconoclasm two phases of violent controversy, separated by a Catholic restoration[4].

a) The first phase of the Iconoclast repression lasted from 725 to 780 under *Leo III the Isaurian* (717-740) who ordered the destruction of images in 725, and under *Constantine V Copronymus* (740-775), who imposed Iconoclasm on the Council of Hieria (753); during this period the most outstanding defenders of the faith were St. Germanus and St. John Damascene.

b) The period of Catholic restoration was due to the Empress Irene and the Patriarch St. Tarasius; The lind Council of Nicea (viith (Ecumenical) defined the lawfulness of the veneration of images in 787.

c) A fresh attack by the Iconoclasts was begun by Leo the Armenian (813-820) and lasted for thirty years. The veneration of images and traditional orthodoxy were successfully defended by St. Nicephorus and St. Theodore of Studium.

To these brief historical notes must be added indispensable doctrinal notions for a better understanding of the Fathers. Serious clashes, arising out of mutual misunderstanding, have occasionally taken place between the East and the West. The chief cause is a very real divergency of view-point. The difference in the meaning of the terms employed on both sides makes it all the more imperative to grasp the exact nature of this divergency. Almost all

1 See J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise byzantine,* p. 253 sq.

2 It should be added that Leo the Isaurian thought it necessary for the success of his economical and agrarian schemes to destroy monachisi», which, it would seem, was emptying the countryside.

3 Without really enriching it. The lessening of spiritual values which resulted from the harassing of the monks was not otherwise compensated, even materially.

4 Here we will do no more than recall a few names and dates. An account of the events we mention may be found in more specialised histories.

these ambiguities can be avoided by a clear realisation *of* the place that the veneration of images holds in the general theory of worship both in the East and the West.

In the Eastr, theologians, starting from a formal principle (i. e. the motive for venerating each object), distinguished *in practice,* three kinds of veneration : I. an *absolute worship* or veneration paid to God alone, Who is worshipped for Himself on account of His infinite perfection; 2. *a partly relative veneration* paid to the saints, who receive their perfection from God, though in some degree, by their knowledge and love they have made it their own and assimilated it : 3. lastly, a *wholly relative veneration* paid to objects that have received all their perfection from some other, and possess it only materially, though none the less truly.

The expressions used to indicate this worship are *latria* (λατρεία, adoration), *dulia* (δουλεία, service), *honour* (τιμή) and lastly *veneration* (προσζύνησι , literally adoration). All these terms are applied to the worship *of God,* but latria is for Him alone. *I'o the saints* are given dulia and honour; *to images* only honour.

As for the very common expression *adoration* προσκύηνσι; it not only means the worship of latria, as it usually does in English and Latin, but also all worship, and corresponds more exactly to the word *veneration.* When applied to God the latter becomes the *veneration of latria* (τροσκύνησι κατά λατρείαν); below it is placed the simple *veneration of honour* (προσκύνησι τιμητική) paid to the saints and images.

To a certain extent images are grouped with the saints inasmuch as a relative veneration is paid to both ; but in reality, that paid to images is far inferior, since it is chiefly an exterior veneration of honour. With images must be classed relics, crosses and statues. All these holy, though lifeless objects, are paid merely a *relative and secondary veneration,* though a certain order of dignity may be established. Nevertheless it should not be forgotten that they are the direct *object* and in a certain very large sense the *final term* of the veneration paid to them 13 They are venerated on account of God or the saints; we kiss them with respect,

1 See chiefly V. Grumei., *op. cit.,* 787 sq.; 807-810. M. Jugie, 5. *Jean Damascene,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 738-740.

3 Which does not hinder us from raising our minds and hearts to their prototypes; God or the saints, according to the sense given to the word *relative* by the Latins. Cf. below, *the conciliary decree.*

we kneel before them. God himself rewards such veneration by often granting, remarkable favours by means of images thus venerated [1]. The pious excesses of some of the faithful should not be allowed to cast doubt on the lawfulness of these fruitful practices of devotion.

In the West the veneration of images occupies a lesser place. The formal distinction, based on the kind of veneration, comprises but two degrees : the worship given to God i. e., *latria* or adoration ; the veneration paid to saints i. e., *dulia* (hyperdulia is not another degree but rather a kind of dulia). The first (latria) is absolute and the second (dulia) is relative in the formal sense as indicated for the East. However, from another point of view (usual in the West), these two venerations, that of the saints as well as that paid to God, may be said to be absolute, inasmuch as the saints, like God, are honoured *in themselves,* although God alone is honoured for Himself. Their perfection, though received from God, is really possessed by them and justifies a veneration, which, though inferior, is truly given to them personally. This veneration may thus be called *absolute* in opposition to that paid *to images* which is *relative,* not in the previously mentioned formal meaning but in a *modal* sense based on the way in which the object (God or the saints) is reached by the veneration paid to it; for, in reality, the image itself is not venerated in the true sense of the word, but the object that it represents and to which all veneration is really paid. The image is no more than an intermediary[2] and the veneration of images is merely a modality or accessory form of the veneration of God and the saints; in brief, it is purely relative.

This conception of the veneration of images diminishes, in one sense, its importance, or rather its individuality; yet on the other hand enlarges and ennobles it, since it becomes more closely connected with the worship of God and the saints, almost to the point of resembling it entirely. Hence a notable divergency of expression between the East and the West. In the East, *latria* or *adoration* is never given to images of God or of Christ, while western theologians, St. Thomas for instance[3], call adoration, the honour paid to relics of the Cross, to the images and statues of Christ and every religious object that represents the Divinity. The reason for this is that we pay homage to the person through the medium of the image. Yet in spite of these very real divergencies of view-point and marked differences of practice, it cannot be denied that on this point there exists an agreement of principle between the East and the West. It should be noted however that the

[1] Nevertheless it has been possible to reproach the Orientals with regarding images as a kind of sacramental and with ascribing to them the same powers as their original. Thus, the *spatharius* John made a statue image of St. Demetrius, the god-father of his son and was approved by Theodore of Studium (*P. G.*, 99, 962-963). That was an abuse that could have been suppressed without destroying the practice of veneration itself.

[2] It is not however only a chance concomitant of the worship paid to its prototype, but possesses a real importance founded in reality which is not purely fortuitous.

[3] *Sum. theol.,* III, q. XXV, a. 3. See V. Grumel, *op. cit.,* col. 825-836.

Latin theologians express themselves conformably to the definitions of the Council of Nicea, though less literally than the Greeks.

The IInd Council of Nicea (787) based its judgment on the Oriental viewpoint when it condemned the error of the Iconoclasts which was spreading more freely in the East. As it was necessary to refute the accusation of idolatry made against the veneration of images, the inferior nature of this veneration was stressed : " *We define with alt certainty* and care, that both the figure of the sacred and life-giving Cross, as also the venerable and holy images..., *are to be restored*... that is to say, the images of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, of our immaculate Lady the holy Mother of God, of the honourable angels and all saints and holy men. For as often they are seen in their pictorial representations, people who look at them are ardently lifted up to the memory and love of the originals and induced to give them respect and worshipful honour (τιμητικήν -ροσκύνησιν), but not real adoration, which according to our faith is due only to the Divine Nature. So that offerings of incense and lights are to be given to these as to the figure of the sacred Cross, to the Holy Gospel-books and other sacred objects in order to do them honour, as was the pious custom of ancient times. For honour paid to an image passes on to its prototype; he who worships an image worships the reality of him who is painted on it"1. It is clear that the worship here indicated is truly relative in the Latin sense of the word. Nevertheless it differs from the worship of the prototype inasmuch as it cannot be termed latria when paid to an image of God ; further, all images, whether of God or the saints are to receive the same kind of inferior worship i. e., worship of honour.

Pope Adrian I (772-795) had furthered the holding of this council, and sent to it his legates who approved its decisions. These decrees became the rule for the universal Church. Some expressions, however, translated much too literally, were not properly understood in the West, and led to controversy, an account of which may be found elsewhere 2. We will now give some account of the Oriental doctors who defended the traditional faith against the Iconoclasts.

1 Mansi, *ConciI.*, xui, col. 377-380.
2 See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, m, p. 473.483.

III. THE PATRIARCHS AND THE DEFENCE OF IMAGES.

A) St. Germanus of Constantinople «.

St. Germanus was the first bishop to denounce the Iconoclasts. He was then at the end of his career. He was born in Constantinople about 635. Justinian, his father, an officer of the court of Heraclius and Constans II, was put to death when Constantine Pogonatus IV came into power in 668. About this time Germanus entered the clergy. Whether he took any part in the long and detailed discussions of the Vlth Council in 680-681 is not known. It is certain however that he was in favour of the condemnation of Monothelitism. He became Bishop of Cyzicus at the beginning of the Vlllth century and was present in his official capacity at the synod of 712, convoked by the emperor *Philippicus* (711-712) at Constantinople for the purpose of renewing the error that had been condemned in 681. Like St. Andrew of Crete, Germanus was weak enough to yield to the emperor's whims, thinking thereby to avert greater evils. With the death of Philippicus things returned to normal. As patriarch, Germanus was to show himself capable of resistance when the faith appeared to be really threatened.

In 715 he was raised to the See of Constantinople which he occupied for 14 years. His patriarchate was rendered noteworthy by its coincidence with the beginnings of *Iconoclasm* in 725. He tried in vain to dissuade Leo the Isaurian from pursuing his policy. To some bishops who were too amenable to the emperor he explained the perils of interfering with a practice clearly approved by the Church. The *three letters* written on this occasion are Germanus' only extant writings on the veneration of images : the others were destroyed by order of Leo the Isaurian. The latter would brook no opposition and deposed the patriarch in 729. He died three or four years later in 733. Together with St. John Damascene and George of Cyprus he was excommunicated by the Iconoclast council in 753, but rehabilitated by the (Ecumenical Council in 787.

39'454· **Studies:** F. Cayré, *Germain (saint)* in *Diet, théol.*, col. 1300-1309. V. Grumel., *Z'Iconologie de St. Germain,* in *Echos iVOrient.*, 1922 (t. 21), p. 165-175.

Germanus is known to posterity chiefly as an orator and particularly as a panegyrist of the *Blessed Virgin.* Of his 9 extant discourses, *y* are devoted to Our Lady L They deal chiefly with the two following themes : the incomparable purity of the Mother of God ; her universal mediation in the distribution of supernatural favours. As regards the first, St. Germanus' witness, recalling that of his contemporary St. Andrew of Crete, is precious for the development of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception 2[1]3 His colourful style is somewhat redundant and verbose. His ideas are obscured rather than clarified by his lavish use of imagery.

In addition to these works and various extant *liturgical poems* 3, his written work still comprises four theological opuscula and the three above mentioned dogmatic letters.

These four opuscula deal with various subjects ; one is a plea to the Armenians in favour of the Council of Chalcedon4; the second is a dialogue on death, justifying the ways of Providence from the Scriptures5; the third, written after 726, is a polemical and historical essay "on the heresies and the synods"6; lastly the fourth, a mystical explanation of the Oriental masses7, in spite of many later interpolations, is also probably due in substance to Germanus8.

None of these writings is without doctrinal interest. The previously mentioned letters, however, are more precious as regards the teaching of the first defenders of the images.

St. Germanus' teaching on images according to his letters is thus summarised by a recent author: " Here may be found all the essential of traditional Iconology. First, his *refutation* of the charge of idolatry brought against the Church, by means of a thoughtful explanation of the passage of Exodus (xx, 4) on which the Iconoclasts had prided themselves, and by distinguishing several degrees of worship, of which the first alone, latria, is given to God. Secondly,

1 Cf. M. Jugie, in *Echos a'Orient,* 1913 (t. xvi), p. 219-221.

2 See M. Jugie, *Immaculée Conception,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 919-920.

3 Pitra *(furis Ecd. graci hist.,* 11, 296) attributes to him 104 στιχηρά, 22 canons and some *Konlakia.* Cf. E.MEREAU, in *Echos d'Orient,* 1923, p. 428-431. The office containing the Acathistus hymn is also ascribed to him. Thearvic, in *Echos d}Orient,* 1904·1905.

4 *Epistola ad Armenos : P. G.,* 98, 135-146 (only in Latin).

5 *De via termino dialogus : P. G.,* 98, 89-132.

6 *De haresibus et synodis: P. G.,* 98, 39-88.

Rerum ecclesiasticarum contemplatio : P. G., 98, 383-454, interpolated; see S. Petrides' edit., in *Rev. Or. ehrét.,* 1905, (t. x), p. 287-309, 350-364.

' Another treatise of Germanus on Gregory of Nyssa, now lost, cleared him of Origenism. The authenticity of the *Scholia on Dionysius the Areopagite (P. G..* 4, together with St. Maximus' scholia) is very doubtful.

the nature of the *worship of images;* first, a real veneration really addressed to the image and not only to its prototype; then a veneration relative to the fundamental worship of Christianity, which it serves as an embellishment, and also relative in itself, since it is not paid to the substance of the image, but to the image *qua* image, a representation of its prototype " L The doctors who followed St. Germanus did little more than amplifv and clarify this teaching.

B) Other defenders of the images.

1. St. Tarasius, - Patriarch of Constantinople from 784 to 806, was the prime mover in the religious pacification in the reign of Irene '780-790, 792-802), notably at the Unci Council of Nicea which he set afoot, and presided with the pope's legates, and whose labours he directed3. When the council ended he sent an account of it to Pope Adrian observing particularly: "We have adhered to the true profession of faith which you sent to me and to the rulers through me " 4. In a second letter to the pope he explained how he dealt with a number of bishops accused of simonys. The monks considered him too indulgent. Four other *letters*^ and two *sermons* of Tarasius are still extant. One of the latter was preached when he was made patriarch 7 ; the other is a homily-on the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin8 containing fairly explicit teaching on the Immaculate Conception.

2. St. Nicephorus the Confessor, patriarch from 806 to 815, began by having some differences with the monks of Studium ', but these were soon smoothed over and he became a friend and brother-in-arms of the great abbot, Theodore, in the latter's opposition to the new Iconoclast policy begun in 815. He was deposed in this same year and continued to write against the image breakers until his death in about 829. Three long treatises are extant: an *Antirrheticus* in 3 books against Constantine Copronymus, a *Great Defence* and a *Little Defence* *0. A similar work was his *Abridged History* from 602 to 769". There is also extant a long and finely written letter to Pope Leo III ,a. His other letters are

' V. Grumel, *of>. at.y* p. 175.

3 See 1Iei ele-Leclercq, *Hist, cone.,* in, p. 74I-798 *(passim).* Life in *P. G.,* 98, 1385-1424. Works *Ibid.y* 1423-1500 *(ex Mansi).*

3 See above, the Council's doctrinal decrees, p. 320. See Hefele-Leclercq, *Ibid.,* p. 775'792 f°r its disciplinary decrees.

4 *Epist. Ia ad Hadrianum: P. G.,* 98, 1435-1442.

5 */bid.,* 1441-1452.

6 *ibid.,* 1423-1480.

7 *Apologéticas ad populum: P. G.,* 98, 1435-1442.

8 *Ibid.,* 1481-1500.

9 See below, p. 342.

,n Ed. Mai, in *P. G.,* 100, 205-534; 533-832; 833-850. These three writings Were probably composed in an inverse order to that in this edition.

11 Breviarium historicum (or *De rebus post Mauritium gestis); P. G.,* 100, S75-994. A *Chronographia brevis (Ibid.,* 1001-1060) is of doubtful authenticity.

13 P. G., 100, 169-200.

either lost or inedited [1]. Both these letters and his life deserve for him the name of Confessor.

3. Saint Methodius, monk, a disciple of St. Nicephorus and likewise an adversary *of* Iconoclasm, was named patriarch (842-847) on the instance of the Empress Theodora, and was associated with the final re-establishment of the veneration of images and also the founding of the feast that symbolised the triumph of the Church over all heresies i. e., the *Feast of Orthodoxy*[2]. He wrote a little penitential canon dealing with the return to the faith of those who had become Iconoclasts[3]. In his name are also extant two letters[4], two sermons[5], and a *Martyrium* of St. Dionysius the Areopagite[6,7](identified with the Bishop of Paris), but these are not equally authentic.

IV. OTHER ORIENTAL THEOLOGIANS.

The theology of the early writers is usually to be found in their *scriptural* or *controversial* works. The exegetes of the period now under review were few and uninspired [7]. The *catenae* were especially popular. Among the *ascetic writings* may be found a more individual treatment of the moral passages of the Scriptures since their authors profited by their own experience or that of other monks [8]. But such works cannot be properly regarded as theological works, though an exception might be made in favour of the work of the monk Antiochus.

Antiochus, a monk of St. Sabas (Palestine) at the beginning of the vnth century, composed a moral work, *Pandectes Scriptura Sacra*[9], which is more methodical and didactic than the others and which in some ways resembles later moral theologies. The work contains 130 chapters [10]. The first two are devoted to *faith* and *hope,* foundations of the Christian life, and the last three to *charity* and heaven which are its crown: the remainder of the work, ch. 3-127, deals with the moral virtues. The author first indicates, in a fairly methodical manner, the *faults* to be avoided: the well known classification of the capital vices is

1 The three given in *P. G.,* 100, 1061-1068, belong to another Nicephorus. All Nicephorus' work has not yet been published.

2 See J. Pargoire, *IdEglise byzantine,* p. 270-272.

3 *P. G.,* 100, 1299-1326.

4 *Ibid.,* 1291-1298.

5 *Ibid.,* 1271-1292 (On St. Agatha, in Latin) and in *P. G.,* 18, 397-404 (on the Cross, in the works of St. Methodius of Olympus).

6 *P. G.,* 4, 669-684.

7 See above, p. 103.

8 See above, p. 284 sq.

9 *P. G.*. 89, 1431-1850. See S. Vailhé, *Les écrivains de Mar-Saba,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1898 (t. 11), p. 8-9.

10 The Latin translator mistakenly writes "homilies" instead of "chapters" on account of the laudatory expression that closes each chapter.

obviously followed: gluttony, greed, impurity, anger, and sadness, vanity and pride; but he adds useful disquisitions on particular points. From chapter 66 he turns his attention to the *virtues* to be practised; one's duties to oneself, one's neighbour, and to God. The numerous scriptural quotations that fill each chapter justify the title of the work and put it in a place apart from later works on moral theology. This interesting attempt was worth mention, inasmuch as it appears to have provided inspiration for another monk of Saint Sabas in the following century, St. John Damascene.

Theodore Abukara (vmth century), a disciple of St. John Damascene, bishop [1] of Kara or Harran (Syria) wrote in Arabic and was chiefly a controversialist. He refuted all the early heresies practised in his province, Origenism, Nestorianism, Jacobite or Severian Monophysitism, and especially the Jews and the Mohammedans who, at this period, since they had the support of those in power, were a real danger to religion. A collection of 42 opuscula, published in Greek at an early date, has been attributed to him; these are the *Opuscula contra hæréticos, Judæos et Saracenos* [2] to which must be added the work *De unione et incarnatione,* omitted from the preceding series [3]. Several of these opuscula contain no more than a few lines; nearly all are dialogues: an enemy of the faith puts a question or makes an objection and the author generally makes a topical and pertinent reply. The most important of these concise works seems to be the third, devoted to a rational proof of the existence of God, together with the first two and the *De unione et incarnatione* which deal with the Incarnation and its consequences [4], and lastly, the 22nd (dialogue with a Saracen) on the Holy Eucharist, clearly teaching transubstantiation. The works as a whole contain an explanation of the doctrine of Redemption.

In the treatises written in Arabic which are perhaps the only certainly authentic works of Theodore, a similar and

[1] *Abu* means *father* or *bishop.* It is not certain whether he was bishop of Kara or Chonochora, today Quara in Celesyria, or of Carrha or Harran in Mesopotamia. In any case he must not be confused with another Theodore, Bishop of Caria (Asia Minor) in the time of Photius (ixth cent.).

[2] *P. G., 97,* 1461-1602 (Gretser's ed.).

[3] *Ibid.,* 1601-1610 (Gallano's ed. fragment). It should be noted that ten other opuscula have been printed in Arabic by E. Bach A *dorks of Abukara, Bishop of Harran, the earliest Christian Arab writer* (in Arabic) Beirut, 1904. Writings translated into German by G. GRAF, Paderborn, 1910.

[4] Christ delivered us from five enemies: death, the devil, condemnation, sin, hell (op. I).

more confident teaching, especially in *miniar* v, is found. The latter may be considered as a first outline of the *Cur Deus homo,* and its author as " a forerunner of St. Anselm " L

CHAPTER VIII.

Saint John Damascene.

Special Bibliography :

Editions: *P. G.,* 94-96 (M. Lequien's ed., 1712). Studies: General study: M. Jugie, *Jean Damascène (saint),* in *Diet. théol.,* col. 693-751. By the same author; *Vie de S. Jean Damascene,* in *Echos d)Orient,* 1924 (t. 23), p. 137-161. PERRIER, *S. Jean D., sa vie et ses écrits,* Strasburg, 1863. V. Ermoni S. *Jean D.* (Coll. *La pensée chréti),* Paris, 1904. J. T1XER0NT, *Hist. Dogm.,* 111,458-462 and 484-513. Various monographs: J. Langen, *Johannes v. Damascus,* Gotha, 1879. H. LUPTON, *St.John of Damascus,* London. 1883, and article in *Diet, of Christian Biography.* On the Trinity, J. B1LS, *Die Trinitaetslehre des hl. J. v. D.,* Paderborn, 1909; and P. DE REGNON, *Etudes de théol. pos.,* t. I, II, IV (passim). See also K. Krumbacher and A. Ehrhard, *Gcsch. byz. Lilt.,* 1897, p. 68-71, 674-676. J. Pargoire, *EEglise byzantine,* p. 370-372, etc.

I. LIFE OF SAINT JOHN DAMASCENE.

THE DEFENDER OF THE IMAGES.

Until recent times almost all that was known of the life of St. John Damascene was contained in a biography written by the patriarch John of Jerusalem two centuries after the saint's death (end of the xth cent.)2. No one thought of using the more exact details scattered throughout Saint John's own works. This has been finely carried out by Fr. Jugie in the above mentioned studies, though there still remain many gaps in the life of the last of the Eastern doctors. The following is a summary of Fr. Jugie's researches.

' His real name is *Abu Quara.* The *mimar* or Arabic treatises represent for us the chief works of Theodore. The German translater admits only treatises II and iv of the Greek collection. The others however, may have been inspired by the authentic work. See an outline of the author's soteriological teaching in J. Rivière, *Un précurseur de St. Anselme, La théologie rédemptrice de Th. Abu Quara* in *Bull. litt. eccl.,* 1914. p. 337-360 (Reproduced in *Le Dogme de la Rédemption, Etudes critiques et documents,* 1931 η 24.'t-''6',l

3 *G.,* 94. 429-490.

John was born at Damascus; hence his name Damascene, as also that *of Chrysorrhoas,* an allusion to the river that waters his native town as well as to the spiritual treaures that fill his works. If he died an old man in 749' (ἐν χεψ-ώνι επών, in the winter of his eloquence, he says) he must have been born about 675. He came of a wealthy and very Christian family. His lather, John Mansur (Arabic: the Victorious, probably alluding to the surrender of Damascus that had been negotiated by John's grandfather in 634) seems to have held the post of chief financial officer to the Caliphs, representing the Christians and collecting from them the tribute that was due to the conquerors. It is well known that the Arabs were accustomed to accord a relative liberty to the Christians in return for the payment of certain taxes. We cannot be sure of the truth of the story of his having been tutored by Cosmas the Elder, an Italian monk captured by the Arabs, or his upbringing with another Cosmas, called the Younger, an orphan who had been adopted by his father and who became Bishop of Majuma in 742 afer having been, like John, a monk and melode at St. Sabas. On the other hand there seems no reason to doubt that John succeeded his father as tax-gatherer; this may be deduced from the way his name is coupled with St. Matthew's in the acts of the council of 789. It is not easy to believe, however, that he held the position of Grand Vizier *(Protosymbolus)* to the Caliphate[3].

John must have filled these high positions at *the beginning oj the VIIIth century.* But when the Iconoclast controversies began (725) we find him in Palestine, a priest and representative of John IV, Patriarch of Jerusalem. This has been determined beyond question by Fr. Jugie who bases his argumentation on the three famous sermons against the images (726-730): their author speaks as a priest of Sion or Jerusalem, as representing a bishop threatening the heretical emperor with excommunication. On the other hand in the still extant public profession of faith *(Expositio et decía·alio fidei)*[3] made by John on his ordination day, there appears no mention of Iconoclasm, as there certainly would have been had he been ordained at a later date. It must be concluded that John was ordained priest in Palestine in 726··.

1 This historical detail appears to have been determined by S. Vailhé, in *Echos d'Orient,* 1906 (t. 9), p. 28-30 *(Date de la mort de S. Jean D.).*

3 He was lhe leader of the Christians, the leading Christian of lhe country, and perhaps of the Empire and represented them before the Caliph.

3 See below, the *iVorhs,* p. 330.

4 The traditional story of his amputated hand being restored by the Blessed Virgin, as contained in the *Vita* (Xlh cent.) and which is found neither in contemporary records nor in the council of 7S7, is not easy to uphold. The story may be discredited without doubting John's courage or the possibility of forgery by a Byzantine emperor, or the Caliphs' order for the mutilation: moreover the saint's devotion to the Mother of God and his faith in her power is well known. But the fact remains that this incident cannot have taken place before his ordination and it is very difficult to put it at a later date. Further, many extraordinary details contained in the *Vita* give rise to misgivings. See M. JUGIE, in *Echos d'Orient,* 1924, p. 143-144. Nevertheless this popular story still retains its symbolic value, no less than that other well known and charming legend of the Sabaite monk, John, who sold baskets in the streets of Damascus after having been one of the most illustrious personages of the town.

When did he relinquish civil functions? The acts oí the Vllth council, saying that he preferred the shame of Christ to the wealth of Araby, and ill-treatment to the delights of sin, seem to allude to the choice he was obliged to make between Christ and his office. About 710, in fact, the caliphs increased their pressure on the Christians; Omar II (717-720) even deprived them of the right of occupying any public office; there were apostates, but also martyrs. It is very possible that John then left the world and *entered St. Sabas,* a place where he was afterwards to return so often in search of that solitude he found necessary in his life of prayer and study. The literary and philosophical culture that he already possessed enabled him to make rapid headway in theology and even to become a master of the subject, for he seems to have been a professor; in any case he taught from the pulpit as a preacher; he was possibly the official preacher of the Church of Jerusalem, attached to the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre *. The patriarch did not neglect the talents of his new priest and had special recourse to him as soon as the question of the veneration of images arose.

We still possess the 3 *Apologetic Discourses against those who reject the Holy Images'1,* which he composed in the name of the patriarch. The first dates from 726; the two others, which seem to be slightly revised editions of the first, appeared in 729-730. They caused some considerable stir throughout the East and made of their author the leading protagonist of the images. About 730 the Eastern bishops solemnly anathematised the Iconoclast emperor. John's writings unquestionably influenced this condemnation. From these three discourses it is possible to extract the whole theological doctrine concerning images. The following is a summary ;

ci} It is *impossible* and impious to picture God, Who is a pure spirit; but not Christ, the Virgin, the saints, and those angels who have appeared in human form. It is permitted to do so; idols alone are forbidden in the Scriptures.

b} It is *lawful to render a worship to these images,* which through them is addressed to their prototypes and ultimately to God, the fountain of all good. This worship is not latria, προσκύνησέ κατά λατρείαν, but simply προσκύνησέ τέμητέκή (veneration) given to what is not God ; it varies in degree accordingly as the venerated object is more or less near to God, i. e., sacred persons, or simple material objects.

r) *The advantages of images and their veneration* are many: They teach and recall the divine gifts, they nourish piety; they are also canals of grace, a kind of *medium* between their

l See below, among the *Works,* his extant sermons.
9 P. G.t 94, 1231-1420.

prototype and the faithful, even possessing a certain instrumentality in the granting of graces from on high [1].

St. John Damascene did not only refute the Iconoclasts; he also strove against the chief heresies of his time, especially as regards Christology, such a bone of contention among the Orientals. He wrote against the *Nestorians,* the *Jacobites,* the *Monothelites*[2]. Nor were these merely speculative works, the pastime of a solitary. They were rather truly militant writings aimed at real adversaries. John had remained in touch with the Syrian bishops who often appealed to him for help. The treatise against the Jacobites, for instance, was composed at the request of the metropolitan of Damascus and intended for the Jacobite bishop of Dara. The *Trisagion* was a source of division between Catholics and Jacobites; on this subject John wrote a letter, a veritable little treatise, to the archimandrite Jordanis. He composed an explicit profession of faith for the use of the bishop, Elias, probably a former Monothelite converted to Catholicism.

John also entered the lists against the non-Christian sects. First against *Manichaeism* (which was taking on a new lease of life under the name of Paulicianism) and even *Islamism,* the religion of the conquerors. Such a step was not without its dangers. Theophanes relates that Peter, Metropolitan of Damascus, one of the saint's friends, had his tongue torn out by the Caliph's order for having written against these two errors. Against the former John wrote two dialogues in which he treats the noblest questions of metaphysics and theology, porticularly Divine Foreknowledge and Predestination. Also in dialogue form are two short attempts at refuting Islamism. The extant copies are poor. Of greater value is the short chapter from the Book of the Heresies devoted to the same error. Together with these controversial writings may be mentioned two curious fragments *on dragons and fairies,* written against popular superstitions [3].

The life of St. John Damascene was a busy one. His untiring vigour in controversy and teaching was equalled only by the many virtues that enhanced his already great

1 See M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 739-740. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* III, p. 458-462.

2 See below, among his *Works,* these controversial writings, p. 330 sq.

3 For all the writings mentioned, see p. 330.

reputation. History[1] reveals him to us as a *humble* and *obedient* monk, writing only on the formal order of his superiors or friends, imbued with an fiery *charity,* which led him to exalt the Goodness of God above all His other attributes, and filled him with a tender devotion to Mary, the Church and the Saints. Lastly, he was fired with a *great zeal* for the salvation of souls, particularly for the spread of truth and the preservation of peace and unity in the Church.

St. John Damascene died probably in 74.9. The Iconoclast council of Hieria (753) declared him to have been struck by God like St. Germanus and St. George of Cyprus[2] ή Γριά τού τρει καθείλεν; but the Vlllth Oecumenical Council (787) rehabilitated all three of them ή Γριά τού τρει εοο ασεν[3]. In 1890 the title of Doctor was given to him by Leo XIII. Long before that the sure instinct of the faithful had made of him a saint! The vigour of his resistance to the emperor and his heroic renunciation of high office in the service of the Caliphs had made of him almost a legendary figure in the minds of the people. It is difficult to defend the attribution of many works that have been made to him[4]; but his authentic work amply justifies the reputation he has always borne both in the East and the West[5].

II. WORKS OF ST. JOHN DAMASCENE.

A) Theological Works.

His theological (dogmatic) works are by far the most important of all St. John's writings. First must be mentioned his controversial works, that have already been referred to above.

1. *Apologetical discourses against those who reject the holy images*[6].
2. *Against the Nestorians,* two treatises[7].

[1] See M. Jugie, in *Echos d'Orient,* 1924, p. 150-158.

The name of George of Cyprus (d. 754) was always connected by the early writers with those of St. Germanus and St. John Damascene. Together with them, he was a leading defender of the images in the first half of the eighth century. Cf. Ai.LATIUS, *De Georgiis,* in T'ABRICIUS, *Bibl. g.,* X, 613-617 (2nd ed. : XII, 14-16).

[3] Mansi, *Condì.,* xiil, 356, 400.

[4] The *Life of Barlaam and Joasaph,* for instance, *P. G.,* 96, 859-1240. See above p. 284.

[5] See M. Jugie, in *Did. théol., ot>. cit.,* col. 748-751 on St. John's influence.

[6] *P. G.,* 94, 1231-1284; 1283-1318; 1317-1420.

[7] *P. G.,* 95, 187-224; and *Theol. Quartalschrijt,* 1901 (t, S3), p. 555'595·

3. *Against the Jacobites,* also two treatises, and a *Letter to the Archimandrite Jordanis on the Trisagion*[1].

4. (Against the Monolhelites) *De duabus voluntatibus*'[1].

5. *Dialogue against the Manichaeans*[3].

6. *Dialogue between a Christian and a Saracen*[4].

7. *On dragons and fairies*[5].

Before treating of St. John's greatest theological work we must mention in passing four opuscula of lesser interest.

1. *Elementary introduction to dogma*[6], a youthful work much inferior to the first part of the Fountain which deals with the same subject.

2. *Booklet concerning right judgment*'[7], a profession of faith probably written for a converted Monothelite bishop.

, 3. The treatise *On the Holy Trinity**, is a summary of Trinitarian and Christological doctrine drawn from John's works, though probably written by another author.

4. An *Exposition and Explanation of the Faith*[9] preserved in an -Arabic translation is a profession of faith for a new priest, for the day of his ordination. This is sometimes regarded as a short outline of the third part of the *Fountain,* i. e., an *Exact Exposition oj the Orthodox Faith.*

The Fountain of Wisdom[10] (Πηγη γνώσεώ) is undoubtedly the best known and most important of the works of St. John Damascene. It contains almost the whole of his own theological teaching and the best of his other writings that summarise and collate the characteristic dogmatic theses of the great Greek eccleciastical writers who preceded him. The work is dedicated to the melode Cosmas, his erstwhile comrade, who became Bishop of Majuma in 742. The work was therefore completed after that date. It is one of *three parts;* the first two form a philosophical and historical introduction; the third, much longer and more important, is an almost complete treatise of dogmatic theology.

The *1st part* is entitled Philosophical Chapters It contains a collation of definitions drawn from the early

[1] *P. G.,* 95, HI-126 *(Contra acefhalos),* 94, 1435-1502 *(Confra faiobilas),* and 95, 21-62 *(De hymno trisagio).*

* *P. G ,* 95, 127-186.

* *P.* 6', 94, 1505-1584. Another dialogue. 96, 1319-1336 (Mai's ed.).

4 ó*., 94, 1585-1596 and 1595-1598. Another dialogue, 96, 1335-136S.

5 *P. G.,* 94, 1599-1602 *(De Draconibus),* 1603-1604 *(De strygibus).*

6 *Institutio eleinentaris ad dogmata ; P. G.,* 95, 99-112.

7 *Libellus de recta sententia; P. G.,* 94, 99-112.

8 6'., 95, 8-18.

' *Ibid..* 417-436.

,o *P. G.,* 94, 521-1228.

" *P. G.,* 94, 521-676. The title, *Dialectic,* is less apt.

philosophers, Aristotle, Porphyry, and especially the Fathers of the Church, whom John looked upon as his true masters, even in philosophy. John regarded both philosophy and the sciences as the handmaids of that true philosophy of which the Master is Jesus Christ.

The *2nd part,* Concerning Heresy [1] is a historical introduction to theology. It treats of the origin and development of 103 heresies or more exactly, 103 false religious doctrines, as far as Iconoclasm and Islamism. As a rule he simply quotes the opinions of his predecessors, from St. Epiphanius to St. Germanus. His treatment of the last heresies, however, is original.

The *Hird part,* entitled An Exposition of the Orthodox Faith[2] comprises 100 chapters, that have been divided into four books by the Latins, corresponding to the four books of Lombard's *Sentences. Book I* (ch. 1-14) is a treatise "De Deo Uno et Trino". *Book /7* (ch. 15-44) treats of the works of God (creation, angels, world, man) and of Providence. Philosophy and natural sciences also find a fairly large place here. *Book 111* (ch. 45-73) explains the doctrine of the Incarnation by comparing it with heretical aberrations. Lastly, *book* 7U (ch. 74-100) deals with subjects that had found no place in the first three books (faith, sacraments, mariology, Scripture, veneration of the saints, and images) sometimes touches on matters already treated and comes to an end with a consideration of the Last Things. In reality the *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* is a methodical explanation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed.

B) Diverse Works.

1. Exegesis. St. John Damascene's exegetical work is vast but not original. It is a brief but complete commentary of the *Epistles oj St. Paul*[3]. Almost the whole is taken nearly word for word from the homilies of St. John Chrysostom and the commentaries of Theodoret and St. Cyril of Alexandria.

2. Asceticism. It would have been surprising had a monk of St. John's temper not written on ascetic matters. His opuscula on the capital vices *(De 8 spiritibus nequitia)* [4] are unfortunately very short. The same is to be said of the writing *Concerning Virtues and Vices*[5]. His letter *On Easts* treats the special question of the length of Lent.

[1] *P. G.,* 94, 677-780.
[3] *Ibid.,* 789-1228. Prologue and index: 781-788.
[3] *P- G.,* 95, 441-1034.
[4] *Ibid.,* 79-S6. — [s] *Ibid.,* S5-98.

Lastly, there remains the *Sacred Parallels* [*] in which St. John "had brought together the first elements of a a *compendium* of moral and ascetic theology which, had it been developed and systematised, would have formed the counterpart of the manual of dogmatic theology which is the *Orthodox Faith*". As it stands, it is a simple collection of scriptural and patristic texts, skilfully tabulated and indexed. The author divided his work into three books: "The *first book* treated of God, One and Three, the Light of the soul, i. e., of the relative attributes of God and our dûtes towards Him. The subject of the *second* was the knowledge of man and human things. The *third* dealt with virtues and vices, each vice being opposed to a virtue; hence the name of *Parallels,* given especially to the third part and which has wrongly been given to the whole" [3]4 In composing this work John had reference to the writing of the Sabaite monk, Antiochus, mentioned above*.

3. Oratory. John was not only a controversialist, but also an *eloquent orator,* in great demand at Jerusalem at the time of the great feasts. There are extant, for instance, *three discourses* that he gave on the same day, probably at Gethsemani, at the tomb of the Virgin, on the Dormition of Mary. Another discourse on the Nativity of Mary, three homilies (Transfiguration, the sterile fig tree, Holy Saturday) and two janegyrics (St. John Chrysostom and St. Barbara) are all that remain of iis oratorical work, which must certainly have been extensive[5]. Other discourses have been wrongly attributed to him. "His discourses", says Fr. Jugie, "bear a doctrinal stamp that is easily recognised. He invariably speaks as a theologian of the Trinity and the Incarnation. He is capable of being fluent and concise at the same time, and unlike many Byzantines, he never speaks to no purpose. His homilies are certainly his most original work and rich in doctrine[6].[7]

4. Poetry. John Damascene was also a *poet,* one of the most popular with posterity. His hymns "are still sung and afford a divine pleasure to all" enthusiastically cries a tenth-century biographer. Especially should be mentioned :

1.the *canons* of the office for the ordinary Sundays, for the 8 tones *(Octoechos) i.* Although he may not have composed them entirely he is responsible for a large part ;

2. *Metrical verse* (for Christmas, Epiphany, Pentecost)[8] ;

3. *Rhythmical verse* (Easter, Ascension, Transfiguration, Annunciation, Dormition, funerals)9;

4. various *Eucharistic poems* (metrical and rhythmical) ".

[1] *P. G.,* 95, 1039-1588; 96, 9-442. The work has been interpolated and the order of the parts modified.

[3] M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 702-703.

[3] *Ibid.,* col. 702.

[4] See above, p. 324.

[5] Sec these 9 homilies in *P. G.* 96, 545-S14. The four others in this place are of doubtful authenticity.

[6] *Op. cit.,* col. 703.

[7] See above, p. 294.

[8] *P. G.,* 96, 817-840.

[9] *Ibid.,* 843-852; 1363-1370.

[»] *Ibid.,* 813 818 (3 very fine prayers for the preparation for communion.

III. DOCTRINE.

It has been erroneously supposed that St. John Damascene was no more than a compiler. The book, of which we have given an abstract above, proves, on the contrary, that he was capable of truly personal work while giving at the same time an exact summary of the doctrine of earlier writers. He threw fresh light on the teaching of those who had gone before him and expressed it in clear, firm and exact prose, well adapted to his logical and concise method. With the exception of St. Leo, whom he knew only by the *Letter to Flavian,* his masters were exclusively the Oriental doctors, especially the Cappadocians. St. Gregory of Nazianzen is often quoted. In Christology he was inspired by his immediate predecessors, Leontius Byzantinus, St. Maximus, St. Anastasius Sinaita. In the treatise *De Deo,* he followed for preference the Pseudo-Dionysius whom he identified with St. Paul's disciple. As a theologian he was outstanding, but as a *doctor* he does not reach the heights of St. Cyril in the East or St. Augustine in the West. It may be that circumstances did not favour him, for in spite of his very real authority, unlike St. Thomas he did not " turn the minds of his contemporaries in the direction of fresh problems " [1].

A). Doctor of the Incarnation.

All his teaching appears to centre around his Christology. "St. John Damascene is pre-eminently the theologian of the Incarnation. To this mystery he has given the most thought, and few are his writings that contain no reference to it. His synthesis is an admirable summing up of all previous Greek theology " [2]. One of the characteristics of this Christology, says A. Michel [3], " is its rigorous deduction of the theological and dogmatic *consequences of the Hypostatic Union.* On this point he foreshadowed the theologians of the XHIth century in drawing out the *corollaries of the dogma of the Hypostatic Union".*

"St. John Damascene's conclusions are as follows: *a) adoration* due to the humanity of Jesus Christ, not considered as separate from

[1] J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogin.,* in, p. 485.
[2] M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 730.
[3] A. Michel, *Hypostatique (union),* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 504-505.

the Word, but as united hypostatically to the Wordx;¿J the *Divine Sonshipdi* Jesus Christ, the name of Son signifying a relation of person: a sonship that makes impossible for Christ the relation of servant to the Father'; *communication of characters,* of which he gives the rules and justifies the use3; *d) mutual compénétration* of the united natures ττεριχώρησι , deification of the human nature by the Divine (Οείωσι) implying not a substantial change in the human nature, but a communication, in so far as possible, of the gifts, the privileges, the power of action and operation of the Divinity: a participation in the Divine energy4 \e) *absence of all ignorance* in Jesus Christ: the growth of his knowledge being merely apparent5. The perfection of His human nature equally excludes everything which, in *human passion* and suffering, is incompatible with this perfection : no evil passions, absolute subjection of the lower elements to the will, impossibility for the body, although passible, to be touched by suffering to the extent of undergoing a corruption contrary to its dignity6, *f)* Lastly, *duality of operation and will"*7.

Much has been said of the part played by St. John Damascene as a defender of the images. Nevertheless, his teaching on the veneration of images is in no wise central in his dogmatic synthesis. We have dealt sufficiently with this point above8. We will now endeavour to determine the essential points of what the Orientals call " *Theology"* in the true sense of the word 9¡ adding the more characteristic elements of Eastern teaching on *Grace,* the *Sacraments* and the *Church.*

B) "Theology".

Saint John Damascene distinguishes *theologia unita* (θεολογία ηνωμένη) or the treatise *De Deo Uno,* from *theologia discreta* (θεολογία διακεκομμένη) or treatise *De Deo Trino* which distinguishes *(discernit)* the Persons. In reality, however, the treatises are mingled together in his work 10. We will

* *Defide orth.,* III, vili: col. 1013.
' *ibid.,* XXI; col. 1085.
3 *Ibid.,* IV ; col. 997-1000.
4 Η δέ του Κυρίου σάρ τά θεία ένεργεία έπλούΟησε. *Ibid.,* vii; col. 1012. Cf. *ibid.,* XVII; col. 1068-1072; *Contra facobitas* n. 52; col. 1416.
5 *De fide orth.,* III. c. χιν, XXI, XXII ; col. 1044, 1084-1088; *De duabus volunt.,* n. 38; *G.,* 95, 177.
6 *Defide orth.,* III, c. XX, XXIII, XXVIII; col. 1084-1088, 1089, 1097-1100. *De duabus volunt.,* n. 36, 37; col. 173, 176, 177.
7 A. Michel, *loc. cit.* Cf. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* ni, p. 496-501. Sec above, p. 299. Christ as *Redeemer,* Victim of sin and Model of virtue, see M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 736-737.
8 See above, p. 328.
9 See above, p. 95.
10 Cf. M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 717.

consider particularly his teaching on *Foreknowledge, Providence* and *Predestination.* These are subjects to which the Latins have given much thought and on which St. John clearly presents the Oriental viewpoint, differing somewhat from the point of view that was dear to St. Augustine.

First, it should be noted that for St. John, God, Who is simply Being, ὁ ὠν, is also the Good, ὁ ᾽Αγαθὸ : the influence of Dionysius is evident here. Moreover, John adopted this doctrine, and, says Fr. Jugie[1], the whole of his theology is steeped in the idea of the goodness of God; this attribute stands out above all others. The same author makes the following observations on his doctrine of the Trinity : "The Trinitarian doctrine of St. John Damascene constitutes an adequate summing up of Greek theology until his time, but it is to be noted that on some points he shows a marked preference for the Cappadocian Fathers and particularly Gregory of Nazianzen. Our doctor says not a word of the teaching of the *Latin Fathers.* Not one allusion, for instance to the Augustinian theory of the Divine Processions. In some passages the author seems to be on the verge of it, but he never found the key. Though he speaks of the interior word, he never envisaged the Holy Ghost as the *"processio amoris".* This undoubtedly explains his absolute reticence as regards the second procession "[2].

The all-embracing knowledge of God supposes His *foreknowledge offuture free acts;* John deals with this in an elementary fashion. " We are not the cause of God's power of foreseeing our free acts; but the *fact* that He foresees what we must do depends on us; for if we were not to do it, He would not foresee it. God's foreknowledge is true and infallible, but it is not the *cause* of the production of the future act; it is because we are obliged to do this or that, that He foresees it "[3]. John sees God as the cause of all good, but he nevertheless underlines the incidence of the free agent on the specification of the act for good or evil.

[1] *Op. cit.,* col. 718.

[2] *Op. cit.,* col. 718. As regards the procession oí the third Person, St. John Damascene restricts himself to the formulas consecrated by tradition. He denies that the Holy Ghost proceeds εκ του Γιου, because εκ implies a principle without a principle; he prefers to say διά to emphasise that the Son is both co-principle with the Father and principle apart from the Father; this is a more precise formula than ἐξ ἀμφοτερων *(ab utroque)* used by many Fathers. The Photian expression εκ μόνου τοϋπατρό was not used. — [3] M. Jugie, *op. cit., 7iS.*

Providence (πρόνοια) or the care that God takes of all created beings in order to guide them to their end according to their nature, means for St. John "all the positive measures taken by God for the welfare of his creatures, all he *positively* wills for them : that is why John adds that our free decisions τα *iz* ήιχιν, do not depend on Providence, but on our free will : not God but we ourselves take the initiative. God foresees these acts, but does not predetermine them by a positive act of will " h For John Damascene, God's *Providence* is ordered by His Foreknowledge2. By reason of His Providence, God offers grace to all : and it is accepted by those who so will. Even those who reject it are pursued by the Divine sollicitude until their fate is finally sealed by death.

Predestination (προορισμό) to John's mind, applies both to the elect and the damned ; but he understands by predestination the eternal sentence pronounced on everyone by God, as a consequence of His foreknowledge of their merits and demerits3. He does not recognise *antecedent predestination* in the true sense of the word, unless this is what he means by *universal* PROVIDENCE by which God prepares for all, superabundant means of salvation. This universal predestination is *conditional* on account of free will ; it is nevertheless *gratuitous,* being a pure effect of God's will, for of itself nature is incapable of any merit in the order of salvation.

This teaching is neither Pelagianisni nor Semipelagianism, although it considers things from the human point of view as does the latter. It is developed especially in the treatise against the Manichaeans, against whom, St. John, like St. Augustine, felt it necessary to defend and affirm human liberty. In this he was upheld by all Oriental tradition and was thus able to insist on the justice of God4. It must be admitted however that his doctrine, or at least his terminology left in the shade a special aspect of the problem that was perhaps too greatly emphasised by St. Augustine in his controversy with the Pelagians ; *Golfs particularly benevolent and affectionate care for His elects* This special sollicitude, which in no way prejudices the fate of others, has been given the name of predestination in the East. It is quite evident however, that this point of view which puts the rights of God and his mysterious preferences in the first place, must necessarily be treated with the greatest prudence in order not to damage the notion of human liberty. Not all the disciples of St. Augustine have been so careful, and some indeed have taught a predestinationism that Augustine would certainly have rejected. St. John Damascene's doctrine, adopting a different viewpoint does not lend itself to the same difficulties, but it remains incomplete and less profound.

* M. Jugie, *off cit.,* col. 728.

• Προνοείται ο θεό κατά αυτού πρόγνωσιν τών απάντων *Cont. Munich.,* 78.

3 Προορισμό έστι κρίσι και άποφασι επί τόϊ έσομενοι . Κατά την πρόγνωσιν αύτού προορίζει. *Cont. Munich.,* 78, 73·

4 Even more than His Goodness. — 5 See vol. 1 p. 6S8-695·

C) Grace, the Sacraments, the Church.

I. Man [1] and Grace. Here again it is necessary to compare the teaching of the East and the West. Man, composed of matter and spirit, is a microcosm of the creation *vo.κρόκοσμο* , as John himself is fond of saying[2]. With regard to the creation of man, it should be particularly remarked that St. John like all Greek theologians makes a very exact distinction between the *image* and the *resemblance* that God impressed on Adam : the image (τό κατ' εικόνα) signifies the understanding and free will; a kind of natural participation in the perfections of God; the resemblance (το καθ' δαοίωσιν) implies the moral order and the supernatural participation in the Divinity [3]. Our first parents shared in the divine life through the grace that deified them. Further they enjoyed preternatural privileges such as incorruptibility, impassibility and immortality [4].

John Damascene together with the other Oriental Fathers, contrary to a belief initiated in the West by Petau, often refers to Original Sin and distinguishes it from the results of the sin and the sufferings that constitute its punishment. He calls it simply sin (αμαρτία) or curse (κατάρα) or again condemnation (κατάκρισι) [5]. By this sin man was deprived of the resemblance to God (τό καθ' δμοίωσιν) grace and privileges; nature also was diminished by the *aversio a Deo* and the *conversio ad creaturas* of which John speaks explicitly[6]. Fallen man nevertheless retained his free will.

St. John Damascene's teaching on actual grace does away with the accusation of Pelagianism that is too easily made against Greek theologians by the Latins [7]. He affirms that grace in general is *absolutely necessary* for the accomplishment of all meritorious and salutary acts and particularly to overcome concupiscence. This actual grace must be not only *concomitant* (of which he speaks as a rule) but also *preveniente* dependent in all cases on its free acceptation by the will. The following expression would seem to correspond to his ideas on grace : " It should be realised that God gave virtue with the nature and He Himself is the *cause and principle of all Good.* Without His concurrence

1 M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 724-727. — 2 *De fide orth.,* II, 12. — 3 *ibid.*
4 Αφθαρσία, απάθεια, αθανασία. *Ibid.*
5 *De fide orth.,* IV, 13; *De duabus voi.,* 44.
6 *Ibid.,* II, 30. — 7 M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* 741-742.

and co-operation it is impossible for us either to will or do good. But it depends on us to remain virtuous and to follow God who calls us to virtue; or to fly from virtue, that is, to become rooted in evil and follow the devil who sollicits us without violence " 1.

2. The Sacraments2.

St. John Damascene is far from reproducing all the teaching of tradition, even Oriental, in his doctrine of the sacraments. He says nothing of *Marriage* and *Extreme Unction:* a passing allusion to *Confirmation, Penance* and *Holy Orders.* Baptism and the Eucharist alone arc treated in the *Orthodox Faith.* His chapter on the *Holy Eucharist*[3]4 is one of the finest and most satisfying ever written by John".' Fearing to lapse into symbolism, he explains the presence of Christ in the Eucharist with almost excessive *realism:* he even appears unable to admit the Eucharistic accidents. He believes in Tiansubstantiation which he conceives, not as a descent of Christ into the altar-bread, but as a conversion of the latter. The *manner* of the change however escapes him ; he bows before the mystery. The Holy Eucharist is the unbloody and universal sacrifice foretold by Malachy and foreshadowed by Melchisedek. It causes us to share truly in the Divine Nature; hence the name of μετάληψι *(participation)* given to this heavenly bread, as well as that of communion (zotvoma) with Jesus Christ and the brethren.

3. Concerning' the Church 4

St. John makes important statements in various writings and in his homilies on the Transfiguration. It is perhaps to be regretted that he did not devote a special chapter in his *Orthodox Faith* to this subject that was somewhat neglected by the Byzantine East. His teaching is unequivocal :

a) The Church is a society independent of the Imperial power; John states this energetically.

b) The Church is a *monarchical* society. Moreover the monarchy is the only sure principle of peace, order, tranquillity and progress; polyarchy leads to war, division and anarchy 5.

c) This ecclesiastical monarchy is not only diocesan or partial, but also *universal:* Peter was given the government of the whole Church6. St. John writes magnificently in

' *Defide orth.,* II, 30.

2 M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 742-745.

3 *Defide orth.,* IV, 13. See M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 743.

4 M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* col. 715-717; and in *Echos d'Orient,* 1924 (t. 23), p. 400-406 *(Doctrine de S. Jean D. sur l'Eglise).*

5 *Contra Manich.,* 11. — 6 *Hom. in Transfig,* n. 2, 6, 16.

a truly Catholic sense on the privileges of the chief of the Apostles.

d) The *successors of Saint Peter* must be looked for in Rome, where, John declares, the Apostle died in the time of Nero. The bishops, even the patriarchs of Jerusalem ["those who have raised their tents, Churches to Christ, to Mary, to Elias, throughout the world and above all in Palestine"], all these are the disciples of Peter, the sheep whom Christ gave into his care[1]. Saint John Damascene never had any direct relations with Rome and no allusion to reigning popes is to be found in his works. *Saint Theodore Studita* was to speak more clearly of the Head of the Church, induced by the injustice to which he fell a victim, and which forced him to have recourse to the judge of the universal Church.

CHAPTER IX.

Saint Theodore of Studium.

Special bibliography.

Editions: *P. G.,* 99 (Sirmond's ed., XYlith cent.). Studies: Marin, 5. *Théodore* (Coll. *Les Saints),* Paris, 1906. G. Schneider, *Der hl. Theodor von Studion,* Münster im W., 1900. V. GRUMEL, *Idiconologìe de S. Théodore Studile,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1921 (t. 20), p. 257-268. S. Salavi[l]le, *La primauté de S. Pierre et du Pape, d'après S. Théodore Studile,* in *Echos tVOr.,* 1914 (t. 17), p. 23-42. See also J. Bergenroether, *Hist. gen. de ΓEglise,* (Belet's trans.), v. Ill, p. 81-95. J. Pargoire, *EEglise byzantine,* p. 265 sq. Marin, *De Studio, cœnobio Constantinopolitano,* et *Les moines de Constantinople,* Paris, 1897. C. EmereaU, *Hymnògraphi byzantini,* in *Echos dOr.,* 1925, p. 177-179: 1926, p. 178.

I. LIFE OF ST. THEODORE.

THE MONK. THE DEFENDER OF THE IMAGES.

Oriental Catholic monachism[2] so prosperous after the fourth century suffered great setbacks in the eighth. In Egypt it had already fallen a prey to Monophysitism. In Syria the few monks that survived the drastic taxes of the sons of the prophet perished by the dagger of the desert marauders. *Even within the Byzantine Empire* the'monks were unceasingly subjected to attacks by the Iconoclast emperors, who

Ibid., 16. - See J. largoire, *L'Eglise byzantine,* p. 307-316.

attempted to eliminate them, both by ridicule and the use of violence and heavy taxation. In spite of scourge, prison and exile many of the monks put up a brave fight and saw the triumph of the cause of the images under Irene, "whose reign" it has been said' "saw the building of more monasteries than ever before". They suffered fresh trials during the second period of the persecution (813-842) but the victory of orthodoxy shed but greater splendour on their success (842). By their defence of the images the monks safeguarded the most sacred rights of Christianity. They had become the *last champions of the true Christian spirit* in the face of a slavish episcopate ever ready to gratify the whims of the emperors and trample their principles underfoot[3]. The monks stood forth as ardent defenders of the absolute rights of truth, the Church and tradition. Their victory, bringing with it a justifiable pride, made them even more conscious of the mission that was theirs; the duty of openly resisting whoever should again attempt to invade the rights of God, should they be the greatest of the Eastern bishops. To this fiery and unbending type of monk, common at the end of the eighth century and at the beginning of the ninth, belongs Saint Theodore of Studium. He appears to have been chosen by Providence to embody, on the eve of schism, in the town that was to be its centre, the purest spirit of Catholicism.

Theodore[3] was born at Constantinople in 759 of a rich and deeply Christian family, which, in 781, gave all its wealth to the poor and entered the religious life at the behest of Theodore's uncle, Plato, abbot of the monastery of Saccudion (Bithynia). Theodore was twenty two years old, when, together with his uncles and brothers, he retired to this monastery, formerly one of the family estates[4]. Here he was trained in the religious life by St. Plato and was ordained priest in 787 or 788. Shortly afterwards, his uncle falling ill, he took his place as abbot of the monastery which had then become very flourishing. Both Plato and Theodore maintained an interest in the *religions affairs of the empire.* They considered that the patriarch St. Tarasius (784-806) was conceding too much in his attempts at conciliation : they approved the council of 797 only after hesitation and when certain that it was recognised bv Rome. When the emperor Constantine VI *divorced* his wife in 705[5], the

[1] J. Pargoire, *ibid.*, p. 309.

[3] The principle of *dispensation* (οικονομία) was invoked unreasonably, when no grave necessity was in question and in cases that did not admit of dispensation, such as doctrinal questions. Under pretext of dispensation it was thus thought that all manner of *accommodations* and betrayals of principle were justified.

[3] See Marin, *op. cit.,* ch. 1. — [4] *Ibid.,* ch. 11.

[5] This question of the Imperial divorce is called the *Adulterine afair* (from μοιχο' , adulterer), since, by his second marriage, the emperor became an adulterer. For Theodore's attitude, see Marin, *ibid.,* ch. in and VI.

two monks led the opposition, although the emperor had cast *off* his first wife in order to marry one of their kinswomen; the emperor tried bribes and scourging in vain. Theodore was first exiled to Thessalonika, from whence he appealed to the pope, who, while praising his constancy could do nothing to help him. The exile of the monks was brought to an end by Irene's return in 797. They had separated themselves from communion with St. Tarasius because he had taken no action against the priest Joseph who had blessed the sacreligious marriage. When the patriarch finally excommunicated this unworthy priest they were reconciled.

Not only was Theodore reconciled with Tarasius but he also received from him (798) the ancient monastery of Studium in Constantinople, dating from the fifth century. He and his community transferred themselves to this new home, abandoning the Saccudion which frequent Mahommedan raids had rendered insecure. Under Theodore's guidance Studium soon became the foremost monastic centre of Constantinople and numbered as many as a thousand monks. The holy abbot thus came to rank as one of the leading churchmen of the capital. When, in 806, the emperor Nicephorus consulted him on the choice of a successor to St. Tarasius he urged him particularly not to appoint a layman; his advice was disregarded and Nicephorus, a statesman, was named patriarch[2]. This gave rise to ill-feeling between the monks of Studium and this new Bishop of Constantinople, who offended, not only by the fact of his election but also by his friendliness to the priest Joseph who had blessed the emperor's adulterous marriage ten years previously. Finally, the patriarch condemned the monks in a synod (809) and disbanded them. They appealed to the pope, who commiserated them but who was unable to pronounce a proper judgment in this affair. Peace, however, was made in 811. Theodore returned to his monastery: Nicephorous withdrew his decrees and declared he had taken the measures that offended the monks only to avoid greater evils. This patriarch, profiting by his contact with these hardy souls was soon to become, together with the monks, the champion of orthodoxy against renewed attacks on the images.

[2] See *ibni.y* ch. iv. ( )n the patriarch St. Nicephorus, see above p.

Leo V the Armenian^ who, in 814, again put into force the Iconoclast policy of Leo III, the Isaurian, tried in vain to win over Saint Nicephorus; the patriarch chose exile. Theodore of Studium, the patriarch's counsellor, was the most intrepid adversary of the Iconoclast policy. Nor did he lack the courage of his conviction, for he organised a great manifestation in the midst of the town : a procession of a thousand monks bearing ikons. The emperor's answer was to send him *into exile;* but this did not succeed either in silencing him or destroying his influence and unconquerable energy. His letters reveal how active he was in keeping up the courage of his dispersed monks. His correspondance with the popes[1] is deeply moving and extremely interesting. The latter did their best to aid the Catholics, but with no result. *Michael the Stammerer*, however, Leo's successor, proved more tolerant; the prisons were opened and the exiles recalled. Theodore was able to leave Smyrna and settle near Constantinople. Studium, brought low by the treachery of apostate monks was henceforth closed to him. He endeavoured, especially by means of letters[2], to persuade Michael to restore the images and union with Rome; but the emperor turned a deaf ear. Soon he was to die. One of his last councils to his monks reveals his whole soul : " Always be ready, never allow the civil power to be judge in doctrinal matters; have no meetings with heretics; resist until death "[3]. He died near Nicomedia on November **nth** 826. Two years later died the patriarch Nicephorus on June 2nd 828.

II. WORKS.

Theodore's works are fairly numerous. Those that have been published include controversial and ascetic writings, letters, discourses and poems.

I. Controversial writings: these were composed in defence of the images after 813. Among them may be mentioned :

a) Antirrheiicus against the Iconoclasts[4]* in three books (the first two in dialogue form) ;

[1] See P. Bernard a KIS, *Les appels au pape dans PEglise grecque jusqu'à Photius,* in *Echos d'Orient,* 1903 (t. Vl), p. 252-254. P. Van der Vorst, *Les relations de S. Théodore Studile avec Pome,* in *Analecta Bollandiana,* 1913 (t. 82), p. 439-447- . f .

[3] He also took part in the audience of the Oriental bishops with Michael, when they attempted to obtain some hearing for the rights of the true faith : They did not get full satisfaction. Cf. **Marin**, *op. at.,* p. 142-144.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 148. — [4] *P. G.,* 99, 327-436.

b) Refutation of Iconoclast poems ', whose authors are the enemies *of* Christ ;

c) short *opuscula* - on the same subject, to which should be added several *letters.*

2.The most important ascetic writings, together with the letters and the catecheses, are a number of works concerning the organisation of the religious life in the monastery: *Constitutions* for the monks of *Studium* 3, and a double *Penitential**; one general, the other prescribing particular sanctions for faults against the rule. Various *other opuscula* attributed to the holy abbot have a more spirituals content. Lastly, his will, addressed to the monks6.

3. Letters : 278 are extant and printed. They are grouped in two books of unequal size. *Book 1* contains only 57, dating from 796 (first exile) to 815 (beginning of the third); *Book* ***II*** contains the other 221 (from 815 to 826)". This correspondence possesses an immense historical, dogmatic and ascetic interest. " These letters, says Marin8, are overflowing with life and movement, ardent faith and intrepid courage; the noblest and most profound ideas are set out with a sturdy common sense". All manner of questions are touched upon, though asceticism predominates; they are addressed to people of all degrees, popes, emperors, bishops, and simple monks. The writer had but one purpose throughout : "To convert and console souls, to encourage and advise"; this he does, "with the sure touch of a born writer and the untiring zeal of an apostle ". Further on, the same author points out, in addition to the wisdom of the advice contained in the these letters, " the suavity of the style reminiscent at times of the gracious and poetic language of our own St. Francis of Sales " 9.

4. The Oratorical work of St. Theodore comprises : *a) solemn discourses* of which a dozen have been published 10;

' *ibid.,* 435-47S.

* *thia.,* 477-486, 4S5-498, 499-506, 173-182; four opuscula.

3 *Ibid.,* 1703-1720.

4 *Ibid.,* 1721-173° and 1737-1758. Add the *Responsiones,* 1729-1734.

5 *Ibid.,* 16S1-1690. —6 *Ibid.,* 1813-1824.

' *P.* 0'., 98, 903-1670. See a list of 277 others, unpublished, in *P. G.,* 99, 1669-1680, published by Cozza-Luzi, *Nova bibl. Pal.,* Rome, 1871, v vili 1st, p. 1-224.

8 *Op. cit.,* p. 168. — 9 *Op. ciI.,* 178.

«° *P. G.* 99, 687-882 (12 sermons and panegyrics) and 883-902 (funeral elegv for his mother) : sometimes grouped under the title *Book of Panegyrics.*

these sometimes fail to please on account of their emphasis and artificiality; *b) Catecheses* or familiar addresses given to his community three times a week by the abbot; they are charming in their simplicity. Here "the simple graceful language, often poetic in movement, alive with the intense words of Holy Writ, is imbued with a sweet and penetrating unction ". Together with his letters, these form the most interesting part of his work. The 136 of the collection termed *Catechesis Parva*[1] are the more often quoted; another 173 longer ones, make up the *Catechesis Magna,* and for a long time remained unpublished[2].

5. Theodore's poetic work is fairly considerable. There are extant :

a) metrical poetry in Iambic verse (124)[3] on various subjects, particularly on all the officers of the monastery :

b) two canons', one on the Cross, the other on the images;

c) the *Triodion* is the work of himself and his brother Joseph, Archbishop of Thessalonika[5] ;

i/)the *Pentekostarion,* if not Theodore's, certainly comes from Studium.

III. DOCTRINE.

In the true sense of the terms, St. Theodore of Studium was neither a philosopher nor a theologian, but an *ascetic* and a man of doctrinal action who unceasingly proclaimed the lawfulness of the *veneration of images* and the sovereign authority of the *Apostolic See.*

A). Ascetic Doctrine.

It would be impossible to summarise here all the spiritual teaching found widespread throughout the *opuscula,* the *letters* and the *catecheses* of the holy abbot. All these writings would furnish the matter of an almost complete work on ascetic theology in which could be found, adapted to various classes of persons and especially monks, the doctrinal essence of the most famous works on spirituality of the earlier writers, St. Basil, St. John Climacus, St. Maximus. Either from temperament or from duty, Theodore seems

[1] *P. G.,* 99, 509-688. Recent, ed. Auvray et Tougaro, *Parva catechesis,* Paris, 1891.

[2] Cozza-Luzi (*op. cit.,* t. ix, 2nd., p. 1-217) has published, 77, to follow the edition of the *Catechesis parva, ibid.,* t. IX, 1st, (1888), p. 1-318.

[3] *P. G.,* 99, 1779-1812. — [4] *Ibid.,* 1757-1780. — [5] See above, p. 294.

to have been ascetic rather then mystic, more active than contemplative. Even while he was in exile his *unflagging zeal* led him to defend the purity of Christian morals that had been so gravely violated by the Imperial divorce; but it was in the organisation of the religious life that his ardour was most apparent. The virtues on whose development he fondly dwelt are, together with the *spirit oj prayer* which is at the base of all religious life and of which the veneration of images is but an aspect, *obedience* r, which gives a disciplined outlet to initiative, maintains order and ensures both monastic and interior peace; and *work,* suited to the practical and intellectual aptitudes of each monk[2]. In keeping with the old monastic idea 3, he conceived the religious life as a *combat* against the passions and the devil, and also as a fight for the integrity of Christian faith and morals 4; a reaction against the watering-down and weak concessions to which the latter were often subjected at that time, even by those whose duty it was to defend them 5.

B) The veneration of innages.

The teaching of St. Theodore on this subject is the same as that of the other Oriental Fathers whose viewpoint he adopted 6. This has been summed up as follows : " Since the image represents the prototype, the image must also be honoured : hence I. the lawfulness of the proskynesis of the image. Since the image does not possess its own personality, there being but one person both for the image and its prototype, there is not a double proskynesis 7 but one only : hence 2. the singleness and identity of the proskynesis of the image and its prototype. Lastly, since the image has not the same essence as its prototype, but merely bears it some resemblance, the proskynesis is not referred to the image and its prototype *in the same degree :* hence 3. a single proskynesis attains two objects diversely and gives rise to

' See *Catech.,* 48, 77, 98, 125, 126, 128, etc.

8 See, on the organisation of the monastery, Marin, *op. cit.,* p. 46 sq., Cf. *Ponue monasteriales.*

3 See vol. 1, p. 509-510.

4 Cf. *Epist.,* I, 39.

s The all too general apostasy of the Byzantine episcopate (luring the Iconoclast persecution may at least explain the leadership of the monks. Cf. J. PARGOIRE *IP Eglise Byzantine,* p. 300 sq.

6 See V. Grumel. *op. cit.,* p. 257-26S.

1 Sec above, p. 318.

a diversity of terms. The proskynesis is not referred directly to the image as possessing its own substance, but insomuch as it bears a resemblance to its prototype, and is consequently termed, and is, *relative*\ *σγετΜή*. Inasmuch as the proskynesis refers to Christ Himself and attains his Divine substance it is called, and is, a veneration of *latria* λατρευτική [1].

C) The Apostolic See.

The conduct of St. Theodore in the series of conflicts he waged with great personages both of Church and State is perhaps best explained by his passion for the *liberty* and *independence of the Church* in face of the civil power. Xot only is this conviction portrayed by his acts[2], but it is also found in his writings. He perceived and declared with surprising clearness that this independence of the civil power has for its condition and consequence the universal and supreme authority of one spiritual head, the pope. In his letters may be found a summary of the teaching of earlier Oriental Fathers on this primacy. These scattered witnesses have been methodically classified by Fr. Salaville [3], under the following important heads:

a) the primacy of St. Peter, which in turn passed to his successors, is the basis of the Roman primacy [4] and is of right divines;

b) this Roman jurisdiction embraces the whole world [5] and there is no appeal from it [6];

c) the councils are convoked and approved by the popes [7]. St. Theodore's attitude with regard to St. Tarasius and the council of 787, no less than his declarations, reveals his ideas

[1] V. Grumel, *op. cit.*, p. 265. For one of Theodore's exaggerations in this matter see above p. 319 note 1.

[2] See above, n. 343.

[3] In *Echos ιΓ Orient,* 1914, p. 23-42. Cf. J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise Byzantine,* p. 290-291.

[4] Cf. *Epist.,* ii, 12, 13, 86.

[5] I'he bishop of Rome possesses a "divine primacy" (θεία πρωταρχια), a "divine pastoral power" (θεία ποιμεναρχία). *Epist.,* I, 33.

[6] To "the Church that is under heaven". *Epist.,* I, 33 ; Π, 12, 13. Cf. *ibid.,* II, 66, 129.

[7] See *Epist.,* 11, 13, 86.

[8] He wrote to pope Leo III : "According to the practice that has been usual from the earliest times, no orthodox council may be rightly held without your knowledge". *Epist.,* I, 33.

on this matter. He even says that the pope "holds the authority of the Œcumenical councils" [1]

the bishop of Rome is infallible [2] in matters of faith and has never, in fact, erred [3], unlike the bishop of Constantinople who is "*a vassal of heresy*, often living in open rupture with the rest of Christendom" [4].

e) lastly, the papacy is the centre of union and the unity of faith. In 821 Theodore perceives but two means for Constantinople to regain communion with the remainder of the Church : either by holding a synod to which the pope would give the authority of an Œcumenical council, or by uniting itself directly to the pope. Only through the Church of Rome, head of all the Churches, is union possible with the other Churches of Christendom and the patriarchs [5].

Nor was Theodore a voice in the wilderness. Even the heads of the Church of Constantinople at the beginning of the ninth century ; the patriarchs [6] St. Tarasius and St. Nicephorus, held the same views [7]. St. Nicephorus in ^articular, states that the council of 787 "could not have been more lawful and regular, since, according to the *divine laws,* established from the earliest times, it was guided and presided by that glorious part of the Western Church, which is the Church of Ancient Rome" [8] [9] Thus he implies that an *Œcumenical council* (in this context, the Viith) has no value unless approved by the Roman bishop [9]. And the reason for this lies in the *very real privileges of the Apostolic See,* that Church, "without which, no dogma [10] current in the

1 ΓΩ και τύ κράτο ἀναφέρεται τή οικουμενική συνο'δου. *Epist.,* 11, 129. See below, note 9.

3 See *Epist.,* I, 34; 11, 1, 12 and especially 13, in which Theodore wrote to pope Pascal I : "You are the safe and quiet port, open to the universal Church against all the storms of heresy ".

3 *Epist.,* il, 63. — 4 *Epia.,* il, 8, 62.

s 'Ενωθήναι ημά τη κορυφή των 'Εκκλησιών τού θεού, 'Ρώμη, και δι' αυτή τοί τρισι πατριάρχαι . *Epist.,* 11, 74.

6 Letter to pope Adrian. See above, p. 323.

7 See J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise byzantine,* p. 291-292.

3 *Apolog.,* 1, col. 597.

9 In 760, the martyr St. Stephen the Younger rejected the Council of Hieria, saying : " How may we call Œcumenical, a council to which the pope has not consented, when there exists a canon forbidding the ordering of ecclesiastical business without the pope of Rome?" *Vita, P. G.,* IOO, 1144. Cf. J. PARGOIRE, *op. cit.,* p. 290.

,o The word *dogma* is to be understood chiefly of a doctrinal decision but may also extend to a disciplinary decree. H

Church, even should it be previously sanctioned by canonical rules and ecclesiastical custom, can be considered either as approved or finally decided, for Rome holds the primacy of the priesthood and the dignity of the Apostolic college" [1].

At the opening of the ninth century, such was the teaching of the leading defenders of orthodoxy; that orthodoxy, which in 842 was destined to score so brilliant a victory that its name remains symbolic for all the Byzantine churches. This traditional orthodoxy that Theodore represented and which he led to victory at the very hour that Photius schemed for its fall, was clearly none other than Catholic orthodoxy.

[1] St. Nicephorus, Path., *Afolog.*, 1, col. 597.

BOOK IV

The great successors of the Fathers

(From the Xllth to the XVIth century)

INTRODUCTION.

I. THE SUCCESSORS OF THE FATHERS.

The Fathers were the first Christian thinkers, as well as *witnesses to the early faith*. The religion of Christ is founded on a revelation; consequently we should listen more attentively to those who first enjoyed the divine bequest that was entrusted to the Church: they are competent witnesses, possessing an authority that does not belong to later writers. Several of these early authors were not only the channels of tradition but also truly original thinkers. After having defended revealed truth against the errors that threatened to overwhelm it, they began to probe it to its depths. Controversy nearly always resulted in some great speculative work which laid bare the principles of dogma and added to its statement, a rational and theological explanation. It is especially in this latter sense that the Fathers may be said to have had successors, though it must not be forgotten that these, like the Fathers, jealously preserved the original deposit of faith; but since it may be taken for granted that dogmas have been sufficiently established by patristic evidence, our chief interest lies in the study of the clarifications and developments that have been added by these later masters of Christian thought.

These successors of the Fathers are called either theologians or masters of spirituality accordingly as their work consists mainly of doctrinal explanation, even if allied to the affective method, or in direct exhortation to the practice of virtue and the perfection of Christian life. One of these characteristics usually predominates. While St. Bernard is a master of spirituality, St. Thomas is a theologian and

writes of the spiritual life from the viewpoint of a theologian. In some, St. Bonaventure for instance, the two characters are smoothly blended, and result in an admirable completeness. The most eminent of the theologians and masters of spirituality whom we shall study, have received the title of *Doctor;* by which explicit recognition the Church links them up with the greatest of the Fathers \ This however does not imply that they are Fathers in the true meaning of the term, even though some of them have occasionaly been given this appellation.

That systematisation, so admired in our day and which is to be found in all branches of knowledge, was first applied to religious learning by the masters of Christian thought who succeeded the Fathers. Theology, exegesis, canon law, and history have been carefully distinguished, and each of these branches in its turn has been methodically subdivided : theology has thus been classed as dogmatic or moral, scholastic or positive, ascetic, mystical or pastoral. Even in the explanation of dogma is found an equal concern for classification and division. But what is more important in the history of theology was the emergence of the *Schools* which based their principles on a few fundamental truths. These principles rule the whole doctrinal structure and supply a point of reference for answering difficulties ad explaining the truth in a rational way. These diverse forms of systematisation aie to be found in varying degrees in most of the authors we shall study, and though some of them, St. Bermard for instance, may seem to remain faithful to the more liberal method of the Fathers[2], they are distinguished by the very fact from other doctors of the period. In reality, all these methods are new, and are to be sought vainly in the writings of the Fathers. It may also be added that for a better understanding of the Fathers it is essential to know at what period and in what circumstances arose those doctrinal systems that claim to be derived from them[3].

In the following pages we shall deal only with the most influential doctrinal systematisations, especially those that claim to derive from a doctor of the Church, and which, in addition, have *withstood the Passage of time.* We shall not go beyond the XVlth century[4], for at this period those who were the true pioneers of contemporary Christian thought in theology and spirituality had already appeared. In this long period, from the ixth century (end of the Patristic Age) to the xvith, the first three centuries, important enough for the student of the gradual development of Scholastic literature, hardly count for those whose interest lies in original and final doctrinal works. Consequently we

' On the meaning of the word *Doctor,* see vol. I, p. 3.

3 Mabillon calls him the last doctor of lhe Church. See p. 430.

3 This is particularly the case of St. Augustine whose authority was invoked by all the medieval doctors. See below, p. 357.

4 Several details mentioned above are possibly posterior to this period, but they are hardly more than developments of the methods adopted by the theologians of the Middle Ages and the Renascence.

shall treat them summarily. The great theologians and masters of spirituality who best exploited the legacy of the Fathers and formed the great doctrinal schools, flourished from the Xllth to the xvith century.

This study must necessarily be divided into two parts; the Middle Ages and the Renascence. There were two particularly fruitful periods during this revival of Christian learning: I. first, the Xllth and the Ninth centuries which saw the four greatest doctors of the Western Church and mark the *zenith of the Middle Ages;* this was followed by the XIVth century, during which scholastic, theological, and philosophical learning, as well as spirituality, suffered a decline; 2. secondly the XVIth century, which, after the barrenness of the xvth century and the upheavals of the Reformation, was a period of a great *Christian Renascence,* noteworthy for a magnificent revival of doctrinal teaching in all its forms.

The present study does not claim to be a complete or even abridged history of theology and spirituality1; it purposes to furnish in summary form the elements best adapted for inclusion in a *Manual of Patrology:* those elements that may be regarded as the corner stone of the doctrinal edifice raised up by the Fathers. It will, however, enable the student to make some acquaintance with the intellectual achievements of worth that mark the post-patristic period. More often than not they are but remote waterways that have their fountain head in Christian antiquity; but in the present work they will be traced no farther than their immediate and most evident source, without any attempt at thoroughly exploring so vast a subject and as yet so little touched. Following the method we have adopted and in keeping with the title of the work we will attempt to introduce the student to those men who exercised a more powerful doctrinal influence; but those lesser authors, also, who possess some claim to fame will have their place beside the greater; and this contiguity should help to complete to some extent the unavoidable brevity of the notes we are able to give.

Schools and men, whatever their tendencies, provided they remained wholly Catholic, will be treated as objectively as possible, without bias. All these schools, each in its way, have been of use to the Church. And this is not eclecticism. It is quite possible to be firmly attached to a school and even consider its teaching as the integral expression of the truth, without forgetting that this truth has perhaps been perceived only in part: the teaching of the other school, if Catholic, represents a sincere effort to approach the truth, usually from a different angle, but which is nevertheless capable, for the time being, of satisfying minds as yet unprepared for a more penetrating light. In this spirit we shall discuss the various movements that have arisen both in theology and spirituality. These differences, moreover, possess

' The subject is not only too vast and complicated, but also too little studied at the present time.

another advantage, for they reveal the wealth and variety of doctrine no less than the liberty of thought allowed by the Church on undefined questions; further, they may occasionally redress any tendency to narrowness and absolutism that might arise in the absence of any other aspect of the truth.

II. THEOLOGY. METHODS AND SCHOOLS.

A). Methods.

In the Middle Ages, theology became a special subject quite distinct from other religious learning. The Fathers had given their teaching chiefly in the form of *commentaries on the Scriptures.* For a long period this method remained in force in the medieval universities, right up to the Renascence. The usual theme of the masters in theology was a book of the Old or the New Testament which they subjected to a thorough doctrinal study L The studies leading up to these courses, even when systematic, were then considered the object of theology and formed merely an introduction. *Summae* were composed at the beginning of the Middle Ages, but these were originally no more than simple collections of texts concerning canon law, as well as dogmatic and moral theology. These works made great strides in the XHth century and were used to great effect in the work of Peter Lombard; his *Books of Sentences* were explained by the masters in theology[1]3 and when these happened to be men of genius like St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas their *Commentaries* formed complete, original and almost perfect theological syntheses. The *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas marked another milestone on the path of rational systematisation of revealed truth and the great *commentaries* which it occasioned in its turn after the with century have earned it a predominating influence in *speculative* theology.

Together with these great syntheses should be mentioned a number of works written for the purpose of studying some particular subject. All St. Anselm's monographs must be noted, since they opened up fruitful paths of thought: the most famous is that which treats of the *Jtedemftion* ·'. No less important after the XIIth century is the *doctrine of the sacraments**. *Moral theology* began to develop on the practical side more especially in the xvith century s. At the same

1 Denifle, *Rev. thorn,,* 1S94, n. 149-161.
There are extant innumerable manuscript works bv these commentators.
3 See below, p. 410. — * See p. 443. — s See p. 77b.

time the *theology of mystical graces* began to feel its way, setting off from very different starting points In the xivth century close attention was paid to the *theology of the Church*[2] and perhaps the last word was said as regards the relations of the Church with the State, and its government. The aberrations of the reformers led theologians to define more exactly the doctrinal authority of the Church as well as the historic bases of the faith; hence a revival of positive theology. Melchior Cano's systematisation of the *Loci theologici* had the same end in view[3].

It should already be evident that theological works often differ one from the other by reason of the varying methods employed in the study of doctrine. Theology is a rational and methodical study of God as known by revelation; i. e, either of all revealed truths as a whole or some one in particular. The method, however, may vary; hence three principal kinds of theology, of which the types are found in the Middle Ages: *positive* theology, affective or *mystical* theology, and *speculative* theology.

a) First, **authority** may form the basis of a study of the truths of faith that are only known by revelation: a systematic grouping of scriptural and patristic data touching on these truths may provide a more a less profound knowledge of them in proportion to the skill with which the method is used. This is the method of positive theology[4].

b) Greater light on the object of revelation may also be sought in a closer affective **union** with God ; for the perfect love of God is accompanied, due to the greater gifts of understanding and wisdom, with a remaikable perception of God, Who is the supreme Truth, the source of all truth and principle of all supernatural enlightenment; such is the way of mystical theology[5]. In itself nevertheless, it is a prayer rather than *a* branch of learning; it docs not appear in scientific guise except when combined with positive or scholastic theology.

c) The latter has recourse chiefly to **rational speculation** in order to penetrate revealed truth: it consists essentially in applying the principles of reason to revelation in order to seize its significance, comprehend it in the measure that is possible and find congruous reasons. This method though essentially *objective,* is far from excluding mystical enlightenment, as the great theologians of the Middle Ages were well aware. Of itself however it calls to its aid only the objective powers of the mind[6] and places them at the service of the faith. This is the object of speculative theology. It is also termed *scholastic,* taking this word in its narrow' sense. St. Thomas used this method with especial

[1] See p. 691. — [2] See p. 676. — [3] See p. 745.

[4] Practised in an elementary way at the beginning of the Middle Ages (p. 737) and with scientific method since the xvilth century (p. 377).

[5] This explanation therefore does not refer to the *theology of mysticism* or *theology of mystical graces* as above, but to a *theology with a mystical character.*

[6] Ordinary and essential mystical illumination does not entail the revelation of new objects, but enlightens the mind as regards the object of faith: in this sense it is to be considered as subjective rather than objective.

success and the changes he introduced were one of the main causes of his quarrel with the so called Augustinian theologians.

B). Theological Schools.

I. It is customary at the present time to call all the theologians of the Middle Ages *previous to St. Thomas,* the Augustinians. This generic appellation is both well founded and extremely useful. On the one hand it shows that the spread of Thomism marked a date in the history of theology: it was indeed one of the most important events during the medieval period. On the other hand it emphasises the importance of Augustine's influence on Christian speculation of the time. This influence was not cut short by the new systems, but was canalised and regulated by them. Previously, on the contrary, it had been, if not exclusive, at least preponderating in both speculation and piety from the time of St. Anselm to St. Bonaventure. A number of the Oriental Fathers [1] were known, of course, and also the greatest among the Latins, especially Gregory the Great; but St. Augustine's renown was unrivalled and all thinkers claimed him as their master. In actual fact a certain intellectual kinship did bind these authors and link them to their common master.

Nevertheless, though there were Augustinians there was no such thing as Augustinism in the true sense of the word. That would have supposed a *firmly co-ordinated system* of all dogmas and such did not exist. We have not the least idea of suggesting that St. Augustine did not wield a profound doctrinal and even philosophical influence: but "St. Augustine's legacy to Scholasticism consists above all in a mass of teaching on God, the Divine Ideas, the creation, and the spirituality of the soul, which all aim at correcting the naturalistic tendencies of Aristotle in a Platonic sense and which Scholasticism, with the same tendencies, co-ordinated with perfect success"[3]. Further, "Saint Augustine had not the didactic mind. IIis philosophical ideas were incidental and buried in the midst of his religious teaching. Not from him therefore did the Middle ages learn of method"[3]. Neither the cult of Plato transmitted by Augustine to his disciples nor the Platonic inspiration was sufficient, any more than were those central ideas that formed the mainspring of his method.

The word Augustinism is *ambiguous* when used to indicate the philosophical teaching of the so called Augustinian theologians. It falsely tends to attribute to Augustine doctrines that are not his.

[1] Especially those whose works were translated by Rufmus (vol. I. p. 565 sq.). Dionysius the Areopagite (translated in the ixth cent.) and St. John Damascene *(De fide orthodoxa)* after the middle of the Xlith ccnturv.

[3] M. DE Wt l.E, *Hist. phil. mid.,* I, p. 28 29. — [3] *Ibid.,* p. 29.

It is well known that many theories classed under this name are directly opposed to his authentic teaching, while others are quite incompatible and derive from Jewish or Arabic sources'. Further, the Augustinians of the Middle Ages held vastly differing philosophical notions and nothing but confusion can result from any attempt at co-ordination, 'lhe expression may be used in some cases but with "explicit reservations'"[2].

Although there does not exist an Augustinism in the strict sense either as a complete general system or as a body of philosophical learning, there is a wider Augustinism[3] consisting in the *theological spirit of St. Augustine* and his disciples[4]. This appellation is in no wise equivocal and may be applied to all Augustinians in all ages. It undoubtedly supposes some kind of systematisation, but only in a wide sense and touching principles rather than the structure of doctrine. The spirit in question is based on the GREAT THESES dear to St. Augustine, whether they derived from Platonism ora Christian source: I. the fundamental importance of the *idea of God* in all philosophical and theological speculation; 2. the *doctrine of exemplarism* that teaches the way to God though his creatures for whom He is the eternal archetype; 3. *the rights of God* always affirmed in His providental government of his creatures; 4. *mysticism,* or the stressing of man's power of achieving in this world an affective union that entails the vision of God in some measure; 5. a definite *moral doctrine,* teaching that man must act in conformity with grace to the extent of letting it rule his whole life. These theses of course are general, and St. Thomas himself admits them[5][6] Of themselves they allow of no distinction between Augustinians and Thomists. It is possible however to see in them a fundamentally important specific difference that gives a PARTICULAR CHARACTER to Augustinian speculation. They tend to envisage all things from what may be termed a *dynamic viewpoint**. They combine speculation with a moral interest and tend to unite rather than separate the natural and the supernatural order; they emphasise the action of God in his creation, so that both orders of being are considered simultaneously rather than separately. One of the great changes introduced by St. Thomas was precisely the careful distinction, *for the purpose oj scientific investigation,* of the reasonable order from the order of faith, fhe two systems exclude each other merely in the sense that they differ in method; in reality, one completed the other and a true theologian should neglect neither[7].

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 318-321.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 320. See below, p. 474.

[3] It might also be termed *essential* or even *true Augustinism for* it alone possesses *all* the elements that are to be found in Augustine's works.

[4] See vol. 1, p. 714.

[5] In this *very wide* sense St. Thomas is an Augustinian but the wholly methodical nature of his work places it under another head.

[6] As distinct from St. Thoma's *static* viewpoint; the latter, with the scientific method ever present to his mind, studies beings in themselves and all his speculation is ruled by the idea of *being.* St. .Augustine and the Platonists, on the contrary, prefer to consider beings in relation to the First Cause; hence their insistence on *Truth* and *Good* rather than on Being, which of course is always implied. — [7] See below, p. 574 and p. 576.

The intellectual confusion mentioned above, in which were plunged many writers in the Middle ages appears to have been occasioned by the question of the *origin of ideas.* This gave rise to the famous theory of illumination which found such a diversity of explanation in all the Augustinian works'. Nearly all took it to mean a supplementary aid given to nature by God in order to explain the first axiomatic ideas of the understanding. This philosophical point of view would not appear to tally with Augustine's concept; he spoke of Divine enlightenment as a theologian and mystic. In using this term he desired to affirm simply that the first ideas and notions of the understanding are an exceptionally important part of the divine work, inasmuch as they enable man to know God both naturally and supernaturally [*].

2. The Augustinians did not form a school in the true sense of the word. The true Schools imply a general co-ordination of doctrine by means of a coherent philosophical system. Two Schools flourished in the Ninth century; others of unequal importance came later.

Thomism is exclusively St. Thomas' creation : it is based on the Aristotclean philosophy as revised by the Angelic Doctor[3]; although at a later date it was modified verbally on certain points by such as Bannez, the essentials of the system have undergone no change[4].

Scotism represents the Franciscan systematisation of the end of the XIIIth century. Already in the time of St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure had given a philosophical exactitude to Augustinism and built up a complete and coherent system[5]: but this was revised at the end of the century by Duns Scotus who made a greater use of Aristotle though not in the sante way as St. Thomas. This system prevailed in the Franciscan order from the Xivth century onwards[6].

Occamis was a destructive rather than constructive system and stood for much in the decline of Scholasticism[7].

The Aegidian School (of *Aegidius Romanus')* was a Thomism modified and amended on certain points by the adoption of a number of doctrines proper to St. Augustine or at least ascribed to him[8]. It is also called AUGUSTINIANISM [9] or doctrine of the Augustinian order. This word however is more usually given to the doctrine of grace as systematised by the Augustinians Noris (d. 1704) and Berti (d. 1766),[0].

Suarezism was a new and very original systematisation created by Suarez in the XVIth century and holds a middle place between Thomism and Scotism ".

Schools that deal with special points of doctrine, such as *Molinistn* (see p. 771) and *Probabilisni* (see p. 771) do not concern us here.

[‘] See below, p. 515.

[a] Cf. F. Ca y RÉ, *La contuition on vision médiate ae Dieu d'après S. Augustin,* in *Ephemerides theolog. lov.,* 1929, pp. 23-39 and 205-229.

[3] See below, p. 570. —[4] The name *Bannezianism* docs not seem to be merited.

[5] See below, p. 506. — [6] See below, p. 652.

[*] See p. 663. — [8] See p. 640. — [5] See vol. 1, p. 714.

[*o] Ci. PORTALIÉ, *Augustinianisme,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2485-2501.

[“] See p. 7S1.

III. TEACHING ON THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

A.) General notions.

After the Patristic period a certain method was introduced into the teaching of spiritual perfection as well theology. It has been possible to classify various schools of teaching according to their main tendencies: these will be indicated elsewhere[1]. We will restrict ourselves here to limiting in a general way the meaning of the expressions used and the exact nature of the problems that were treated.

The word mystical possessing so many and so different meanings at the present time, requires especial delimitation. We have already noted in what senses it may be taken in theology, and have distinguished its basic and derived meanings[2]. The *basic signification* of the word *mystical* would seem to be that of a conspicuous activity of the Holy Ghost in the soul through the medium of the gifts of understanding and wisdom, so that the soul may produce acts of perfect charity accompanied by some experience of God. The first of the *derived senses*^ the most important of all, is so closely bound up with the former that it may be considered as merely another manner of conceiving it: all the operations of love that bring with them a sensible perception of God, are termed mystical. This activity is almost spontaneous since it is caused by God's showing forth of His presence and perfections in an extremely spiritual manner. Thus, from the human angle, the mystical graces comprise two essential elements: a pure and lively knowledge of the divine perfections and an extremely intense love of God *(infused love).*

The other derived and more remote significations are equally justified since they imply a real though sometimes indirect relation with these essential graces. The use of all the *gifts,* especially active in perfect souls, may be called mystical. And perfect souls may be called mystics in the measure that their *state of soul* corresponds to the outstanding graces they receive. The *extraordinary phenomena* which nearly always go with the most intense essential graces are also mystical ; the latter however are a condition of the former and ecstasies unaccompanied by charity and the above mentioned graces should be looked on with

1 See below, p. 691.
3 Cf. Vol. I, p. 21.

suspicion [1]. But these mystical graces received from God do not dispense from *human activity :* in addition to the loving co-operation with God that they suppose, they tend to provoke a greater zeal for God's service and consequently entail the practice of asceticism either in the moral[2] or the intellectual order [3]. By implication, therefore, all these meanings of the word *mystical* are comprehensive but nevertheless possess a solid foundation.

These acceptable meanings must be absolutely classed apart from those ambiguous and doubtful meanings current in certain circles. The word *mystical* is sometimes taken to indicate that in some natures, affective and sentimental motives prevail over the understanding and intellectual motives. The name is occasionally given to certain external and interior practices by which the initiates of false religions claim to achieve a perception of God similar to that of Christians[4]. This terminology is based merely on outward resemblances and can only give rise to serious misunderstanding. On the one hand, *natural sensibility* is normally not mystical at all and it is by "mortifying" it rather than encouraging it that the soul prepares the ground for God. The overflowing love for God and one's fellows that is known to the true mystic is altogether spiritual and far removed from the other[5]. The practices referred to, tend or should tend of themselves[6], either by eliciting positive acts or by means of mortification to the possession of God. Both the negative and positive exercises of Christian asceticism on the contrary are essentially subordinated to the Divine activity: not only are they based on the word of God, but they receive their efficacy from the Divine activity. Thus the spirit that animates Christian practices differs essentially from the other, and it would be rash to compare them [7].

1 See the criteria of St. Teresa and St. Francis of Sales, p. 858.

3 The qualification of mystical is given by some to all *piety* that is at all intense and affective. It is important however to remember that this is justifiable in a derived sense, even in the case of Christian piety, only in the measure that these pious sentiments are consequences of the essential mystical graces. True mystics are very exacting on this point and carefully distinguish *infused lave* from those *sensible consolations* that are often the fruit of ordinary grace. See St. Teresa p. 818. With greater reason is it to be distinguished from natural sensibility not inspired by true Christian piety. H

3 We may instance the Augustinian method of approaching God by a free use of symbols. The use of symbols does not tarnish the purity of the idea of God ; symbol is of course synonymous with image; but the image is taken as such and as representing something far greater.

4 Pagan, Neo-Platonic, Mahommedan mysticism for instance. These expressions would sound ill to Christian ears did they imply a veritable similarity with Christian mysticism. These so-called mysticisms have a different inspiration; and in mysticism the spirit is everything.

5 See for instance St. Teresa on the spiritual love of others in the *Way of Perfection* ch. 6 and 7.

0 Thus in this respect the word mystical cannot be justified even etymologically. H

7 The word mysticism should also lie treated with caution. I. It is ambiguous if it is employed indifferently of everything that is *called* mystical. 2. More exactly it should be applied to *everything that Christians term mystical,* both doctrine and practice, and consequently is distinct from ASCETICISM, a term that denotes all the means of sanctification that depend on man more than on God. 3. It may also be understood of a *tendency* to be noticed in many authors to emphasise more particularly the action of God, and in this meaning it should be opposed to Moralism (Of. p. 364) See p. 30, vol. 1.

B). Asceticism and mysticism.

Ascetic theology and mystical theology have already been defined by reference to their objectr. To ascetic theology — a subdivision of moral theology — belongs all that concerns human activity in its quest for perfection, while mystical theology — a part of dogmatic theology — is concerned with the extraordinary graces of God. But immediately a serious problem arises: it may be asked whether human moral acts as inspired by ordinary grace are sufficient to lead each soul to the highest perfection possible in this life, or whether the mystical graces themselves are necessary. In other words, are the mystical graces an essential and necessary element of perfection or merely accessory, in spite of their great value and outstanding dignity? The answer is all important even for a proper conception of asceticism, since in the case of an affirmative answer it must be governed by a very different spirit than in the contrary hypothesis [2].

In our day there are current two diverse solutions maintained by authors who have formed, as it were, two contrary schools of thought ; the one regards mystical graces as *noi being necessary* for perfection, the other considers them *indispensable.*

The first opinion which denies the necessity of mystical graces was usual in the XIXth century. Its chief protagonist is Fr. Poulain, S. J., whose work, the *Graces d'oraison*[3], sets out the principles of this school.

' *Introduction,* vol. I, p. 19.

3 The question may be reduced to that of the general vocation to mystical graces, for if they are necessary they *should* be offered to *all.* Here, a *remote* vocation is meant. And this is not a purely theoretical discussion ; it possesses a real *practical* bearing deriving from that ideal proposed to all souls and the means that are granted for its realisation. This vocation should not be confounded with what is known as the individual VOCATION or call, which possesses a greater practical importance. This is direct and *immediate* and is a supernatural sign that some particular soul receives *de facto* these mystical graces and must correspond to them. The question has been best treated by St. John of the Cross. See below, p. 835. The universal vocation — *dejare* — does not exclude the relative rareness of the vocation *de facto :* all are called to holiness, but it is very rare in practice.

3 Aug. Poulain, S. J., *Des grâces d'oraison,* Paris, 1901. Numerous editions. New edition with introduction and notes by Fr. Bainvel, 1922.

He particularly underlines the supereminent and extraordinary natine of these graces as they appear from the saints' descriptions of them; and on the other hand insists that Christian ascetism aided by ordinary grace is capable of guiding souls to holiness. The mystical element may add a divine brilliance to perfection ; but it does not constitute its essential cause. This concept, with a number of modifications, is that of many contemporary Jesuit writers [*on the spiritual life and also of others, both religious and secular[3], notably Fr. Pourrat who usually explains the teaching of early writers on perfection with this theory as his basis[3].

Since the opening of the XXth century the opinion that holds the necessity of mystical graces has made a considerable advance and tends to become general among theologians. The chief leader of this movement is Canon Saudreau; in a series of studies[4] he has shown that the contrary thesis defended by Poulain is relatively recent and that the early tradition until the XVIth century was more favourable to the teaching of the necessity of mystical graces; further, he distinguishes among the latter the essential elements (alone necessary) and the accessory phenomena which are extraordinary. Moreover, this thesis has been based on St. Thomas' doctrine of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. It supposes two stages on the way to holiness: one of preparation dominated by the *ascesis,* i. e., human activity; the other mystical, i. e., in which God's action in the soul prevails. This doctrine has found zealous champions among the Dominican theologians[5] especially Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange[6]. It is maintained by a very large number of religious, Benedictines, Franciscans, Carmelites, even Jesuits and by an ever growing number of secular priests. Many modern authors nevertheless remain outside the orbits of these two schools, either maintaining a prudent reticence or taking from both opinions what is most in conformity with their theoretical or practical leanings[7].

The Middle Ages were not divided on the question as are the present day schools of thought. It was too important not to have escaped notice, however. Profoundly mystical as was medieval thought, it was able to solve the problem without controversy. Medieval spiritual teaching was frankly turned towards contemplation and there is a

[*] Bainvel *(op. cit.),* Billot, de Maumigny, the *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique.*

[3] Some Carmelites, Mgr Lejeune, Mgr Farges, etc.

[3] *La spiritualité chrét.,* v. I, Preface.

[4] A. Saudreau, *Les degrés de la vie spirituelle,* 2 vols, Angers, 1S96 (5th ed. 1920). *La vie d'union à Dieu et les moyens d'y arriver, d'après les grands maîtres de la vie spirituelle,* Angers, 1900 (3rd ed. 1921). *L'état mystique,* Angers, 1903. *Les faits extraordinaires de la vie spirituelle,* Angers, IQoS (2nd ed. 1921).

[5] FF. Arintero, Gardeil, Joret, *La vie spirituelle.*

[6] In *Perfection chrétienne et contemplation d'après S. Thomas et S Lean de la Croix,* Saint-Maximin, 1923. y

[7] See tor instance An Tasqurrby, *P,Ids * thiqlogû autliqm d mystique.* Tournai, 1925 (p. S66-9S7). z y »

clanger of misunderstanding it, should this element be overlooked r. On the other hand we cannot expect to find in the writings of this period, the exactness of expression and viewpoint that is presented in the modern opposition. To the early writers, the gap that separated the two conceptions appeared less wide. The idea of ascetic theology that was set out above is calculated to afford the reader a better grasp of the medieval point of view2.

In this conception the (ascetic and mystical) complex nature of the unitive way is shewn in greater relief. It is possible, of course, to stress particularly the *mystical* nature of this way3, on account of the great dignity of the eminent graces that characterise it and which penetrate the whole life of the soul. Such a method possesses great practical advantages and points the differences that distinguish the perfect way from the preceding ones (purgative and ascetic) which are wholly ascetic. But from another angle 4 it is equally possible to underline the *ascetic* nature of the unitive way itself, thus linking it up with the other ways, so that the continuity of the spiritual life becomes manifest. This method provides direct guidance5 for souls, for the divine operation 6 does not suppress, but orders and guides human actions. Not only before and after prayer but even *during the time offrayer* the soul must act: *a)* in order to maintain itself or put itself into the disposition for receiving divine graces and in order not to let them pass it by through neglect; *b)* To these graces the soul must correspond with a peaceful and loving deliberation, for it is rare that the soul's activity is entirely suspended by the influence of God: *kora rara, mora parva!* says St. Bernard; *c)* further, the essential of the mystical graces, that part which is properly supernatural and infused, can co-exist in an attenuated but nevertheless sensible degree together with a certain activity of the mind; this takes place during certain prayers and even study that is animated by perfect charity, such as implies a special intervention of the Holy Ghost7. On all these heads,

1 See below, the *Schools of Spiritual teaching in the M. A.,* p. 692.

2 Vol. I, p. 19.

3 Thus if the stages of the spiritual life are reduced to the three traditional ways, we have the following degrees :

1. purgative way: *ascetic state ;*
2. illuminative way : *ascetic state {zs* a whole);
3. unitive way : *mystical stale* (as a whole).

As defined from this angle the first two are treated in ascetic theology; the third in mystical theology. See vol. 1, p. 22.

4 This consists in a difference of method rather than a doctrinal divergence.

5 On the other advantages of this method see our *Contemplation auguslinienne,* p. 271-275.

6 We refer especially to that eminent divine activity which in the saints is called CONTEMPLATION, *a loving and in some sort sensible knowledge of God.* See vol. I, p. 22-26.

7 The indispensable signs of this are: *a)* spontaneity of the act of love which should be, as it were, instinctive and precede rather than accompany the activity

the unitive way may be regarded not only from its mystical angle but also from its active *ascetic* angle; this is the method we have adopted with a view to clearness. Nevertheless, it is important to observe that this is a very special asceticism ; it is wholly imbued with mysticism [1] and that is why we have chosen this method as better calculated to explain the complex nature of the way of perfect souls[2]. This complexity of treatment is also one of the most outstanding traits of early doctrinal works both on the spiritual life and theology, especially among the Augustinians[3][4]

C) Diverse points of view.

Although the above mentioned doctrinal opposition may not be commonly found in the early writers on spiritual perfection, it is possible to discover more or less well marked tendencies corresponding to the one or the other of these doctrines. Some masters of the spiritual life are particularly inclined to throw into relief human activity or asceticism: we call this tendency *moralismi* such for instance are the representatives of the school of Windesheim or St. Ignatius Loyola. Others, on the contrary, are attracted by the *mystical* element: this tendency we call *mysticism* [4]; this is very noticeable in St. Bernard and St. Teresa. Yet these tendencies are not exclusive; the most mystical of them take into account mysticism, even in their more spiritual explan-

of the mind; *b)* some sensible perception of the perfection of God; *c)* purity of the idea of God inspiring a true disdain for created and sensible reality, yet consistent with the use of symbols. See p. 360, note 3. These qualités are found in active contemplation or contemplative meditation and make them perfect. See vol. 1, p. 25-28.

1 This is notably the case in that active application of the mind to God which we term *contemplative meditation.* This may consist simply in study that is wholly imbued with supernatural inspiration by means of the knowledge and love we have mentioned, or in true *prayer,* when the mind in its consideration of the divine perfections, the humanity of Christ or the works of God in general, is scarcely active at all ; the purest supernatural love prevails. Various passages in St. Anselm, St. Bernard and St. Bonaventure cannot be fully comprehended if these notions are overlooked.

2 Here, the stages of perfection may be qualified as follows:

1. Purgative way : *ascetic state;*
2. illuminative way: *ascetic state* (as a whole);
3. unitive way; *ascetic* AND *mystical* state.

Those who hold that the mystical graces are extraordinary and not necessary call the unitive way: *ascetic* OR *mystical* state, ascetic for some, mystical for others. This alternative, however, would not seem to correspond sufficiently to the point of view of the early writers. See p. 691.

3 See above, p. 357. Vol. I, p. 670.

4 For the meaning of this word see p. 360, note 7.

ations [1] and ascetics like 'Thomas a Kempis write enthusiastically of the mystical union [2].

Another effect of this divergency of viewpoint among various writers should not be neglected. This is the special object that each one has chosen for consideration and study. The spiritual life is infinitely complex. Its apex, *union ivith God,* which may be called the specific element, can be regarded from different angles. It is hardly possible for one author to treat them all, and those who adopt one angle of treatment do not usually claim to discredit the others. Instead of insisting on the contrasts between various writings on perfection we must look upon them as supplementing one another. The method which consists in drawing out the differences may be more attractive, but it is not easy to apply to teaching on spiritual perfection. We can instance considerable divergencies as regards the union with God; they are easily found in the great authors but it would be rash to interpret them as being contradictory. Saint Augustine[3] according to his synthetic method often treats of this union as wisdom, both divine and human, affective and illuminating, the perfection of man and a participation in God. St. THOMAS [4] as becomes a theologian gives greater prominence to the gifts of the Holy Ghost, particularly wisdom. St. John OF THE CROSS [5] accords the chief place to the active and passive (infused) *purifications* (nights) that condition the union with God. Sl\ Teresa [6] prefers to write of the *infused graces* that gradually lead the soul to this union and carefully records the stages of this supernatural journey. St. Francis OF Sales [7] connects all these gifts with the *love of God* to which they lead and which forms his main consideration, Bossuet [8] at grips with the refinements of a too subtle mysticism rightly stressed the radical necessity of the *theological virtues.* 'These selected methods of treatment, though not exclusive, evidently give a special quality to individual doctrines; but it would be unwise to regard them

1 The great mystical Doctor, St. John of the Cross, devotes a whole volume to asceticism, the *Ascent of Carmel,* which deals with the necessary-active pnrifications for the attainment of union with God.

2 See below, p. 707. — 3 See vol. I, p. 686-688, 703.

4 See below, p. 613. — 5 See below, p. 829.

6 See below, p. 814. — 7 See below, p. 855.

8 See p. 865.

as being in opposition L Such divergences are on the contrary of great value, for it is due to them that we are able to compose a wide and judicious synthesis, a more comprehensive and richer notion of the teaching on spiritual perfection.

IV. GENERAL NOTES OF A PHILOSOPHICAL AND LITERARY NATURE.

A). Philosophical notes.

In the Middle Ages, works on theology and spiritual perfection were more closely bound up than ever before with *philosophical literature.* One of the characteristics that best distinguishes the sucessors of the Fathers from early writers is the place they give to *philosophy* in their works. Philosophy is the mainspring of the speculative method which has helped theologians to construct their powerful doctrinal syntheses; the theological schools are its natural corollary. *Platonic* philosophy furnished the essential elements of one such system, not perhaps to all the Augustinians who preceded St. Thomas, but certainly to St. Bonaventure. His system of course immediately gave way, even among the Fransiscans, to another deriving from *Aristotle,* but this perhaps is to be regretted. In reality, the framework of the greatest scholastic methods was borrowed from a revised form of *Aristoteleau* philosophy; for instance, Thomism, Scotism especially, and later, Suarezism. This introduction of rational speculation in the statement of the faith has evidently not changed its content but it has worked a deep and lasting change on the manner of its presentation. As the remainder of this study will show, theology owes much to philosophy.

Philosophy in its turn owes much to theology, particularly its splendid rebirth in the Middle Ages. The most profound problems of metaphysics were examined and solved by theologians in the course of their theological studies. The question of universals was undoubtedly discussed with enormous zest mainly because it lies at the roots of all philosophy, but the discussion was stimulated in no small measure because of its application to Theology, especially the Trinity, as may be seen in the hrst attempts at a solution from the pens of Roscelin,

l Though certain real divergences have arisen at times, even between the saints, St. Bernard and St. Peter the Venerable for instance.

Abelard and Gilbert de la Porree, corrected later by St. Anselm and St. Bernard. The debates that centred around the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, brought great precision to the theory of matter and form, substance and accidents etc. St. Anselm's resolute speculation on the idea of the perfect, drew the attention of the most vigorous thinkers to the very foundations of Theodicy. And as for the great mediæval philosophical syntheses they can nearly all be found in the commentaries on Peter Lombard's manual of theology the *Books of Sentences.* In the absence of theology at a time when natural sciences may be said to have had no existence, philosophers would have been restricted to sterile dialectic exercises without much benefit to the mind. In reality, faith was the mentor of reason in the Middle Ages, providing it with new confidence and a vigour and depth of speculative thought that has never been bettered.

Whatever definition is given to Scholastic Philosophy », it must always be held to be in agreement with, and even subject to faith, whose object is the nobler. But this does not imply that the Christian thinkers of the Middle Ages undervalued reason and its accomplishments. Some there were, of course, who seemed to abhor dialectics, but more often than not they were really attacking abuses. Mystics like St. Bernard maintained a distrustful but not hostile attitude2; others such as St. Anselm and St. Bonaventure preserved an unwavering confidence in philosophy. The latter, it is true, would not admit the use of reason apart from faith, but this was because he wanted philosophy to demonstrate fully and uncompromisingly the whole of rational truth, combining the natural and the supernatural 3. In practice, as speculative reasoning became more widespread, philosophy, never confused by true theologians with theology or the explanation of dogma, grew in importance; already after the Xilth century 4 it possessed its own methodsand principles, and works of a purely rational nature were composed. In the Xlllth century the Angelic Doctor, greatest of theologians, clearly stated the principle of the *distinction between the two fields of knowledge* 5. By this affirmation St. Thomas established the independence of philosophy and prepared the way for all that is sound in modern speculation. It is clear that St. Thomas did not hold this independence to entail

1 See M. de Wulf, *Hist, de taphtl. m¿d.t* I, p. 10-30.
3 See p. 428. — 3 *See p. 507.
‹ " Philosophy was first confused with theology, but was recognised as a special learning in the Xilth century. At that time the two sciences possessed their own methods and principles, developed side by side and evolved on similar lines M. de Wulf, *op. cit.}* p. 22. — 5 See p. 573.

a necessary separation from theology, much less any opposition to faith [1]. These latter tendencies, which are the most negative characteristics of modern philosophy do not derive from Thomism but from its antithesis, Occamism [2]. Occam's work was aggravated and carried on by Luther [3] and these contrary influences have baulked Scholasticism *of* much of its fruit.

B). Literary Notes.

The literature we are about to treat, whether theological, or ascetic and mystical, was for the most part composed in Latin. Up to the XVIth century this was the tongue of men of letters, who all belonged to the clergy, at least in name. This common language was of great help in fostering intellectual relations between the different countries of Western Europe and made up, to some extent, for the fewness of books and unfavourable social conditions. Of this medieval Latin literature all manner of works are extant. *Tiicology, philosophy,* and works on *spiritual perfection* prevail; but other subjects are represented, sometimes by writings of real worth. *Exegesis* is linked up with theology, as also *Canon law* at first before allying itself with civil law. *Sciences,* first studied in Aristotle, gave rise to original compositions after the XIVth century. In addition we may mention *sacred oratory, history, letters* [4], *verse :* the " Dies iræ" the "Ave maris stella" and the " Jesu dulcis memoria" are each in their way true masterpieces. These works, for the most part still in manuscript, have less interest as a whole than the theological and ancillary works that alone concern us here [5].

Taken as a whole, Medieval Latin literature possesses lesa artistic worth than that of the Fathers, although an absolute judgment in this matter is not easy. We must take into count outstanding personalities,

1 See p. 575. — 2 Sec p. 663. — 3 See p. 717.

4 We should also cite a number oí attempts at a continuation of the *De Viris illustribus* (cf. General Introduction, vol. i, p. 15): by Sigebert de Gembloux (d. 1112), *Liber de ecclesiasticis scriptoribus, P. L.,* 160, 547-588 (170 pieces); Honorius of Autun, *De luminaribus ecclesia, P. L., V]2,* 197-234 (4 books composed of extracts from St. Jerome, I, Gennadius, II, St. Isidore, III, and diverse authors, IV). At the Renascence appeared the *De Scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* of Jean Trithème (d. 1516) (for this author, see Hurter, *op. cit.,* col. 1161-1170) and *Bellarminc* (see below, p. 768).

5 More complete lists will be found in Hurter's valuable *Nomenclator,* vol. II, 1903 (3rd ed.). *

different styles and different ages. A wide gap separates the Caroiovingian revival of the ixth century, a period of groundwork and preparation, the xiith century renascence, which, combined a great intellectual effervescence with a certain effort at style ', from the great Renascence of the xvth-xvith century when the essentials if not the whole of the authors craftmanship lay in his style. And yet St. Bernard, a member of no School, achieved a literary perfection and beauty as fine as it is unaffected. As for the scholastics in the true sense of the word — and they are legion — their chief care was for a solid doctrinal foundation, clearness and method in explanation, exactitude and preciseness in expression : when necessary they did not fear to coin new words : like all sciences, theology and philosophy should possess their own technique, a style of their own, and it is from this angle that it ought to be judged. Someone has happily spoken of St. Thomas' " metallic density " of style. By this is meant that in this branch of literature the value of the style lies in its yielding to the wealth of matter that is offered to the reader. The great scholastics excelled in this austere discipline and many did not lack a certain eloquence, the consequence of their sincere and communicative love of unalloyed truth.

The Middle Ages, as has sometimes been averred, were not blind to classical antiquity nor did they despise it. Their knowledge of it, however, was but rudimentary, especially as regards Greek literature and they sought ideas rather than beauty of form. The aesthetic beauty of these early works was ordinarily a closed book to them and its discovery was left to the Renascence, when Scholasticism had begun to decline. .Although this new intoxication of beauty caused many humanists to lose for a time both their faith and their morals, others remained faithful and these are the more numerous : during the prerenascence in the Italy of the XIVth century, there are found, in addition to Boccacio (d. 1376), Dante (cl. 1321), Petrarch (d. 1374 and the Augustine Luigi Marsigli (d. 1394). Though Pagan humanism seemed destined to prevail, particularly in the XVth century, a sound Christian instinct finally triumphed and consolidated in part the breaches that had been made. In the following pages we shall mention several works by humanists written on Christian subjects : they do not contain as a rule the fulness of supernatural life that characterises the works of the saints[3]. St. Francis of Sales' humanism [3], for instance, was wholly transfigured by his apostolic zeal.

Side by side with humanism occurs the final emergence of the national literatures which were to supplant Latin, first outside the universities and then in the universities themselves. It is interesting to observe that the men of letters who were most attached to the classics were the first to launch this movement ; such were Dante and Petrarch *in Italy*. Nor did the Church, in spite of its traditional use of Latin, show itself unfavourable to this regional development of languages. Many religious works, as we shall see, were composed in the new tongues, *In Germany* Eckart, Tauler, Suso are judged to be the best

1 True humanists are already found al Chartres, especially John of Salisbury.

3 See P. Pourrat, *op. cit.*, III, p. 76-93;

3 See the other outstanding qualities mentioned on p. 859·

representatives of middle high German [1]. The *English mystics* in the XIVth century are also closely connected with the growth of the language [2]. St. Teresa, however, appeared during the best period of *Spanish literature,* and she ranks among the first of Spanish writers. The religious quarrels did much to spread religious works in the popular tongue : Luther and Calvin gave the example and the defenders of the fait i had to follow, either by means of direct controversy or by a wider dissemination of works in defence of the truth written in the vernacular. *In France,* St. Francis of Sales [3] was skilful enough to combine in his many sided works — preaching and controversy, moral and mystical writings — all that was best in the Middle Ages and the Renascence — a deep sense *of* the supernatural[4], a love of symbolism and allegory[5], aesthetic tastes and an acute psychology : he has exercised a lasting influence on the French mind as well as the language, of which he was an acknowledged master, when it was at a turning point in its history. But it is his teaching that holds the greatest interest for us, for its influence was great and far-reaching.

V. GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR BOOK IV.

A considerable number of the general works, collections of texts, and studies listed at the beginning of volume I *(General Bibliography,* p. XXXI sq. and *Introduction,* p. 12-18), often extend beyond the Patristic age. This is especially the case for Migne's *Patrology (ibid.,* p. 14). These works may therefore be consulted for Book IV. Similarly, many of these books dealing with a special subject and included in the special bibliography for some of the following chapters, also contain valuable general outlines. Below are listed works that cover a whole period, or at least a considerable part of it : they may therefore be used for reading with all t le chapters, even should they not be given in the special bibliographies.

[1] These were pre-eminently the German mystics. We mention them here, of course, from another point of view. Cf. p. 702.

[3] See p. 705.

[3] We purposely omit a number of works anterior to his.

[4] In the middle Ages all is imbued with religious feeling. Even the first patriotic epics, particularly the *Chanson de Roland* (xith century) contain passages of almost supernatural inspiration. Cf. J. Bedier, *Les légendes épiques,* 4 vols, 190S-1913.

[5] French medieval *didactic* literature, almost wholly ecclesiastical, is extremely allegorical, even to excess. And it would seem that this trait was less " a primitive process" than a result of the exaggerated and refined product of the intellectualism of the period. The model of this class is the *Roman de la Rose* (1st part by Guillaume de Lords; the 2nd part, written later by Jean de Meung is more remarkable for its outrageous satire and ribaldry, severely censured by churchman, especially Gerson).

A) Works on Ecclesiastical and Religious Literature.

H. Hurter, S. J., *Nomenclator literarius theologice catholicos,* vol. π (years 1109-1563), Oeniponte, 1906 (3rd ed.); (years 1564-1663,, 1907 (3rd ed.).

O. Legipont, O. S. B., *Historia rei literaria: O. S. Ben.,* Vienne, 1754, 4 vols.

The Maurists, *Histoire littéraire de la France* (from the origins to the xiith cent., vol. i-XII, by Dom Rivet, 1733-1763); continued by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, since 1814: general index at end of vol. XV (for the period anterior to the Xlllth cent.), 1875; in vol. xvi begins the study of the Xiiith cent.; vol. XXXIII (1906) deals with the middle of the XIVth cent. The articles are of very diverse provenance: the authors of vol. XXX, for example, are Félix Lajard, Ernest Renan, Barthélemy Hauréau (editor , Gaston Paris, Léopold Delisle).

J. Quétif and J. Echard O. P., *Scriptores Ord. Prcedicatorum,* 2 vols.; Paris, 1719-1721. Continued by R. COULON since 1910.

L. Wadding, O. F. M., *Annales Minorum,* 8 vols., Lyon, 1625-1654; continued and augmented to more than 20 vols by various authors (See Hurter, *op. cit.,* col. 961-964).

F. Ossinger, O. S. A., *Bibliotheca augustiniana,* Ingolstadt and Munich 1776 (accounts of 1400 Augustinian writers).

Cosine de Villiers, O. Carm., *Biblioth. carmelit.,* 2 vols., Orléans, 1752.

C. Sommervogel, S. J., *Bibliothèque des Ecrivains de la Compagnie dec)* vols., Paris, 1890-1900 (new edit.).

P. Feret, *La faculté de théologie de Faris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres,* 7 vols., Paris, 1894-1904.

H. Denifle, O. P., and E. Chatelain, *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis,* (monumental work ; text with translation and notes), 4 vols, Paris, 1889-1897.

M. Grabmann, *Gcschielite der scholastischen Literatur,* 3 vols, Freiburg, 1909-1911.

A. Clerval, *Les Ecoles de Chartres au moyen âge du Ve au XΓP s.,* Paris, 1895.

P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'avcrroisme latin au XIIF s.,* Freiburg, 1899, re-edited in 2 vols, 1908-1911; *Frères Prêcheurs (la théologie dans ΓOrdre des),* in *Diet. théol.,* col. 863-924.

P. Edouard d'Alençon, *Frères Mineurs,* in *Ilici, théol.,* col. 809-863.

X. Le Bachelet, *ele, Jésuites,* in *Ilici, théol.,* col. 1012-1108.

B) Works on Theology and the internal History of the Church.

J. A. Schwane, *Dogmengeschichfe,* 1862-1890; Fr. trans., Degert, *Hist. des Dogmes,* vol. iv-vi, Paris, 1903-1904.

Ph. Toreilles, *Le mouvement théologique en France depuis ses originesjusqu'à nos jours,* ixth-xxth cent., Paris (undated, beginning of this cent.). Summary.

Th. Heitz, *Essai historique sur tes rapports entre la philosophie et la foi de Berenger de l'ours à S. Thomas d'A,,* Paris, 1909.

G. Robert, *Les Ecoles et l enseignement de la théologie pendant la première moitié du XIT s.,* Paris, 1909.

J. de Ghellinck, S. J., *Le mouvement théologique au XIIe* x, Paris, 1914.

P. Pourrai, *La théologie sacramentaire,* Paris, 1907 ; *La spiritualité chrétienne,* vol. 11 (Middle Ages), Paris, 1921; vol. III (Modem Period), 1925.

L. Saltet, *Les réordinations. Etude sur le Sacrement de VOrdre,* Paris, 1907.

Doni Lottin, *Les éléments de la moralité des actes,* in *Revue néo-scol.,* 1922, p. 25-65, 281-313; 1923. p. 20-56. Several other similar articles bv the same author.

J. Riviere, *Le dogme rie la Rédemption. Essai d'étude historique.* Paris, 1905; *Le problème de ΓEglise et de l'Etat au temps de Philippe le Bel.* Paris, 1926.

L. Salembier, *Le grand schisme d'Occident,* Paris, 1900 (5th ed. 1921.'.

Hefele and H. Leclercq, *Hist, des conciles,* vol. v, sq.

Noël Valois, *La France et le grand schisme d'Occident,* 4 vols, Paris, 1896-1902 ; *La crise religieuse du XVe s. Le pape et le concile,* 2 vols, Paris, 1909.

J. Guiraud, *L'Eglise et les origines de la Renaissance,* Paris, 1902; *L'inquisition,* Paris, 1928.

A. Baudrillart, *L'Eglise catholique, la Renaissance et le Protestantisme,* Paris, 1904.

A. Dufourcq, *L'Avenir du christianisme,* vol. v-vil, Paris (4th ed. 1925, amended) : incisive general considerations.

G. Goyau, *Histoire religieuse,* vol. v of the *Histoire de la nation française* by G. Hanotaux, Paris, 1922.

A. Van Hove, *Prolegomena* (vol. l), to the *Commentarium lovaniense in cod. Juris can.* Malines, 1928 (historical part, p. 36-333).

Numerous MONOGRAPHS in the *Encyclopaedias* mentioned in vol. I. The Middle Ages are studied in special *periodicals,* particularly Benedictine *(Revue bénédictine, Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale,* 1929) Dominican (listed in vol. 1), Franciscan *(Archivum*

C) Works on philosophy, Literature and Christian Art.

M. de Wulf, *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale,* 3rd ed. revised and brought up to date, in 2 vols., Louvain, 1924. *Histoire de la philosophic scolastique dans les Pays-Bas,* Louvain, 1895 (2nd ed., 1910). *Introduction à la phil. néo-scol.,* Louvain, 1904. Several volumes in the collection, *Les philosophes Belges.*

B. Hauréau, *Hist, de laphil. scolasi.,* 3 vols, 1872-1881 (very erudite, but misinterprets several doctrines, says M. de Wulf). Numerous scholarly studies on philosophical manuscripts.

Cardinal Gonzalez, *Historia de la filosofia,* 3 vols, Madrid, 1879.

F. Pieavet, *Esquisse cPune hist, générale et comparée des philosophies médiévales,* Paris, 1905 ("series of separate articles; he confuses scholastic philosophy with religion in the Middle Ages; wrongly thinks that the scholastics got their inspiration from Plotinus", says M. de Wulf, p. 36).

Willmann, *Geschichte des Idealismus,* vol. IL Brunswick, 1907 (2nd ed.)

CL Baeumker, *Die europàische Philosophie des Mittelalters,* Berlin, 1913 (in *Kultur* der Gegenwart, I, v). *Beitrage zur Geschichte der Phil. d. Mittelalters* (Collection of valuable studies by the editor Baeumker in collaboration with von Herding, F. Ebrie, M. Baumgartner and M. Grabmann), Munster, since 1891. More then 20 vols have already appeared.

E. Gilson, *La philosophie au moyen âge,* 2 small vols (coll. Payot), Paris, 1922. *Etudes de philosophie médiévale,* 1921. Collection *Etudes de philosophie médiévale,* directed by E. Gilson, at Paris; 10 vols so far. The same author in collaboration with Fr. Théry, O. P., edits the *Archives d'hist. doctrinale et littéraire du M. A.,'* a collection of various monographs, founded in 1926.

Fabricius (xvillth cent.). *Bibliotheca Latina media et infima: atatis,* Padua, 6 vols., 1754.

Du Cange (xvuth cent.), *Glossarium medice et infima latinitatis,* 3 vols, Paris, 1678 (new edit., Paris, 1840-1850, in 7 vols) cf. HURTER. *op. cit.,* IV, 483-486.

Petit de Julleville, *Histoire ae la Langue et de la Littérature française des origines à 1900,* 8 vols, Paris, 1895-1899 (work of collaboration).

J. Bédier, *Les légendes épiques,* 4 vols, Paris, 1908-1913.

E. Mâle, *L'art religieux (in France) du XIP* Paris, 1923; *du XIIB s.,* 1898 (4th ed. 1919) *dela fin du moyen âge,* 1908, (2nd ed. 1922).

A. Fabre, A. A. *Pages d'art chrétien,* Paris, 1917 (3rd ed. 1927). *Manuel d'art chrétien,* Paris, 1929.

FIRST PART

THE MIDDLE AGES

CHAPTER I.

Remote beginnings of Scholasticism.

SPECIAL bibliography : see the notes on each author

I. THE IXTH CENTURY.

A) The Caroloving'ian renascence.

It would be a grievous error to think of the golden age of Scholasticism, that thoroughly Christian revival of the antique philosophy, as a spontaneous growth due only to the intellectual and literary genius of a few great minds raised up by God in the Xllth and Xlllth century, and without roots in the past. This period, on the contrary, may be compared with the IVth century of the Patristic period which would never have existed without the labours of the Fathers of the first three Christian centuries. The zenith of Scholasticism had its long preparation in three hundred years of obscure but fruitful work from the VUIth to the Xlth century. The Barbarian invasions had destroyed the whole edifice of the Roman world. New peoples had taken the place of the ancient civilisations. They had to be educated anew in every field of knowledge, much as the new converts of the first three centuries had to be trained anew from a religious standpoint. The works of the Fathers, miraculously saved from the shipwreck, were the instruments of this rebirth. Religious conversion marked the first stage in this long and difficult task which owes so much to Charlemagne The schools that were founded under his patronage and by his emulators were the true cradles of the Scholastic movement. And among the men who greatly hastened the progress of the movement two deserve particular mention: Alcuin and Rabanus Maurus.

These names must always be associated with the names of the men who may be termed the ancestors of Scolasticism; St. Augustine,

Boethius, Cassiodorus, St. Gregory the Great, St. Isidore of Seville and the Venerable Bede, to whom may be added Dionysius the .Areopagite among the Orientals'. St. John Damascene who was not translated, and that but poorly, before lhe middle of the Xllth century, exercised but a tardy and superficial influence on the development of Scholasticism. Far different was the influence of *Boethius* who has been called "the first scholastic" and from whom all knowledge of Aristotle was derived in the Middle ages prior to the xintli century·'. Greater still was that of *St. Augustine*[3] who transmitted to the medieval thinkers all that was best in Plato, so carefully pruned in the more subtle matters, so complete in many others, that Platonism could be considered as the philosophical system most apt to Christian speculation. But though these early writers had left a rich vein to be worked it would have given but poor results had it not been for the labours of those who have been called the great Scholiasts, among whom Alcuin must be given first place.

Alcuin[4] (735-804) an Anglo Saxon, first studied in the English Benedictine monasteries, though it is not certain that he himself was a Benedictine, and from the year 766 was at the head of the Bishop's School at York. He was carrying out an official mission in Italy in 781 when he met Charlemagne who succeeded in attaching him to his court. He granted him several abbeys, notably that of St. Martin of Tours (796) and employed him as his "intellectual prime minister" as Guizot puts it. Alcuin directed the *Palatine School* where Charlemagne himself with his sons and daughters attended his lessons and joined the literary academy that he founded. He helped and perhaps inspired all the Imperial laws in favour of teaching. He instituted the *trivium* and the *quadrivium* in his school, according to Cassiodorus' scheme. The large place given to *dialectics* in this syllabus was eventually destined to have far reaching consequences and from this point of view Alcuin may be considered as Picavet says, "the true author of the philosophical revival in France and Germany"[5].

* For all these authors see books 11 and in.

2 M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen methode,* I, p. 14S sq.

3 *Ibid.,* p. 125 sq. Cf. E. Portalie, *S. Augustin,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 2325-2331; *Augustinisme, ibid.,* col. 2501-2506.

4 See P. Moncelle, *Alcuin,* in *Did. hist.,* col. 30-40. See also Dom Cabrol, *VAngleterre chrit. avant les Normands,* Paris, 1909.

s This should of course be taken in its right context, remarks Dom Cabrol. "Though he has been called "the Erasmus of his age" it should not be forgotten that this century was little removed from barbarianism and that it is a far cry from the refined humanist of Rotterdom to the modest and, after all. mediocre scholiast of York". *ibid.,* p. 164. He was nevertheless a real pioneer: "Even his idea of learning was really new; his vigorous Germanic

His writings gave permanence to his influence'. They treat of· i) *theology* (chiefly the Adoptianist controversy) ; 2) *Holy Scripture* (many commentaries, various treatises and a revision of the Latin Bible); 3) *liturgy* (Alcuin aided the emperor in his great liturgical reform)-'; 4)*philosophy* and *moral theology* (treatise on virtuesand vices, treatise on the soul); 5) *hagiography* (four lives of saints); 6) *teaching* (diverse treatises. Lastly, in addition to several *poems* and his *letters* (nearly 300, the most important source for the history of Charlemagne), a treatise defending the necessity of *confession,* and " *Questions and Answers jor children",* the first known catechism. To him also should probably be ascribed the " *Caroline books" of* which more will be said below.

Having received Charlemagnes' permission to leave the court, Alcuin went to Tours in 801. He reformed the monastery and re-organised the studies; the school of Tours owes its fame to him. He died there in 804. He was never more than a deacon. His disciple Rabanus Maurus wrote his name in his Martyrologium. It would not seem that he was ever honoured as a saint.

Rabanus Maurus 3 (776-856) was the pioneer of religious studies in Germany as Alcuin had been throughout the whole empire. He was born at Mainz, was a monk at Fulda, and became Alcuin's disciple at Tours and later introduced his method to his own country. After having been scholiast at Fulda he became abbot from 822 to 842. He resigned in this year to devote himself entirely to study. In 847, however, he became Archbishop of Mainz until his death in 856.

The *written work*l· of Rabanus Maurus is fairly vast. He commented almost the entire *Bible.* He composed in addition a great encyclopaedic treatise *(De universo),* a philosophical work *(De anima),* a treatise *De Institutione clericorum,* homilies, many opuscula, an *Eulogy of the Cross* and lastly a *Martyrologium* (in which he gives January 14th as the date of the death of the sisters of Lazarus at Jerusalem). Rabanus Maurus was a scholar possessed of vast learning, but quite lacking in original views.

B). Theology in the IXth century. Chief controversies.

A considerable flow of literary works resulted from the initial impulse given by Charlemagne. Most of it however

method in dialogue form, with its rapier-like answers is a fine exercise in mental gymnastics; he can see all round a question; from a dialectic viewpoint he paved the way for scholasticism by giving it a method P. Moncei.LE, *op. cit.,* col. 35.

' In *P. L.,* 100 and IOI (Froben's ed., 1777). See the list in P. MONCELLE, *op. cit.* col., 35-39.

3 Cf. F. Cabrol, *Les écrits liturgiques d'Alcuin,* in *Xev. Hist, Eccl* 1Q"3 (t. XIX), p. 507-521. 1

3 See Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 1903, 1, col. 794-801. i'

4 *P. L.,* 107-1x2, (G. Colvenerius' ed., 1626). 3

is curiously impersonal. Even the greatest authors of this period aspired to be no more than faithful echos of the past. Their favourite and almost sole method consisted in compiling1. Collections of *Flores, Sententice* and *Excerpta* had an enormous vogue. These "sententiae" may be classed under three heads : those which simply follow the order of the Patristic works from which they are drawn ; those that are arranged according to the order of the Scriptures : lastly, those arranged logically according to the subject matter. This last arrangement, better adapted to doctrinal teaching, opened the way for true theological manuals, such as that of Peter Lombard in the Xllth century. It was employed particularly in exegesis (Alcuin, Walafrid, Strabo); in asceticism *(De amore cœlestis patria,* by Haymo of Halberstadt; Alcuin's *De virtutibus et vitiis;* the *De fide, spe et caritate* of Paschasius Radbertus) ; and even in *philosophical matters* (Boethius supplied most of the matter in the controversy on the universals).

Nor did the theological controversies help in giving a definite form to scholastic method. The disputations consisted for the most part in an interchange of quotations. We give below a short account of the chief matters discussed. Many of these controversies were provoked by the growing dissensions between the Byzantine Church and the \\ estern Church : others were of purely Western origin.

i. Controversies with the Greeks.

The three following were of greater importance.

a) The veneration of images2, solemnly proclaimed and defined at the I Ind Council of Nicea (787) was for a long time rejected by the Franks, on Charlemagne's instance. His reasons, in addition to the ambiguous translation by which the Latins learnt of the decrees of the Council, appear to have been the Germanic dislike of portraying the human body in religious ornament, and a growing aversion for the Byzantines. The official stages of this controversy were as follows : 1) The composition of the *Caroline Books*3, probably by Alenin, in 790, at the emperor's request. These works forbade even the relative veneration of images and permitted only their use; 2) The Council *of Frankfort* (794) at least condemned the adoration of images and the

* G. de Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théologique du XIIe s.,* Paris, 1914, p. 20-28. G. Robert, *Les Ecoles et renseignement de la théologie, (XIIe s.),* Paris, 1909, p. 126-130.

2 See T. Tixeront, *Hist, dogm.,* iit, p. 473-4S3.

3 *P. L.,* 98, 999-1350. See J. Maréchal, *Les livres car.,* Lyon, 1908.

Council of Nicea which was supposed to have authorised it ; 3) the Council of Paris (825) which restated approximately the doctrine of the *Caroline Books.* Yet in spite of this opposition and various Iconoclast excesses', the true teaching on the veneration of images gradually penetrated the AVest after the end of the ixth century.

b) The adding of the "Filioque"[2] or the " Et Filio" to the text of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed concerning the Holy Ghost *qui ex Paire* Fil io q u e *procedit,* also raised a storm. The doctrine that teaches that the Holy Ghost proceeds not only from the Father but also from the Son was current in the West since the time of St. Augustine who had explained that He proceeds *principaliler*[3], i. e., *originaliter, primordialiter,* from the Father alone; He proceeds truly from the two principles but not in the same manner. Both manners are well expressed by the Latin word " to proceed " but the Greek word ἐζπορεύεσΟαι by which it was translated, was better adapted to the procession from the Father. There was thus incurred a risk of misunderstanding, especially as the East underlined the difference in the modes of procession by the expression *qui a Patre per Filium* (*pP* Τιοὐ) *procedit.* It was possible with a little understanding to show that the two viewpoints were not contradictory, as was done in the vnth century by St. Maximus with regard to a similar text of pope St. Martin I which astonished the Orientals[4]. The question was raised at the Council of Gentilly (767), near Paris, but found no solution. The situation was aggravated by the custom that came in at this time of singing at Mass, the *Credo* containing the *Filioque,* in Spain and in Gaul. The *Caroline Books* blamed the Greeks for their expression on the procession of the Holy Ghost[5]. Shortly afterwards the Greeks at Bethlehem accused the Latin monks of being heretics on account of the *Filioque.* Pope Leo III, without condemning the doctrine, tried to suppress the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed. He was not obeyed and matters remained as they were. Soon, however, Photius came to exacerbate this difference of opinion, which might have been setted quite peacefully. 'IK

c) The Photian controversy, if measured by its results, was the most serious controversy of the IXth century. At the outset it was no more than a personal quarrel. Photius (820-897)[6] was a brilliant man of letters, the leading light among the crowd of intellectuals and artists that frequented the Byzantine court in the middle of the IXth century. Twice he occupied the patriarchal see of Constantinople (858-867, 878-886) but in spite of repeated

‘ At Turin, fomented by the bishop, Claud. «

2 M. Ju g ie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium,* i, Paris, 1926, p. 154-179. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.,* iv, p. 518-526.

3 *De Trinit.,* XV, c. xviu and c. XXVI. Cf. M. Ju g ie, *op. cit.,* 157-158.

* *Ibid.,* 158-160. — s *Lib. carol.,* IV, c. 3.

61 Hergenrother, *Photius Patriarch von Konstanlinopel,* 3 vols, Ratisbon, 1867-1869; *Photii De Spiritus Sti~ Myslagogia,* 1857. M. Ju g ie, *op. cit.,* p. 101-256 (doctrine). Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 1, col. 780-785.

manoeuvres, requests, blandishments and threats, and even open revolt, he never succeeded in obtaining recognition by the Holy See. This was rendered impossible by the refusal of the true patriarch Saint Ignatius (d. 878) to resign. The unscrupulous means adopted by Photius to obtain this dignity only went to show up his unworthiness. His thwarted pride led him to rebel against the authority he had been unable to seduce, and to this end he employed all the redoubtable powers of his remarkable mind and unscrupulous will.

Photius' written, work [1] bears witness to the breadth of his culture if not to the depth of his learning. His Myriobiblion consisting not of "ten thousand volumes" as he somewhat fatuously said, but of 280 volumes that he had read and summarised, constitutes an incomparable source of historical information. His CORRESPONDENCE[3], comprising at least 264 letters, is also a first class document for ixth century Byzantine history. His ORATORICAL works [4] consisting for a long time of only a few published discourses have recently been augmented by the editing of 128 sermons or homilies. His truly DOCTRINAL WORK is represented by three writings: 1. The *Amphilochiana** is a collection of 324 answers made to the same number of questions on exegesis, theology and philosophy put to him by Amphilochus, Bishop of Cysicus. Many are but extracts from the Fathers and all are based on their writings. 2. The *Contra Manichaebs*[6] contains three books refuting Manichaeism, preceded by a very impersonal historical account. 3. The *De Spiritus Sancti Mystagogia* [7] is a treatise on the procession of the Holy Ghost. Lastly, a fairly voluminous CANONICAL WORK contains a collection of canons, *{Syntagma canonum* and a *nomocanon* [9]; both are adaptations of similar earlier works rather than original compositions. There is extant also a number of poems [10].

Of these writings the most important is the *Mystagogia Spiritus Sancti.* This base work has been for hundreds of years the arsenal of Greek polemists in the *Filioque* controversy. Taking ἐζπορεύεσΟαι *(to proceed)* in its narrowest sense as meaning *to proceed from a principium absque principio*^ Photius claims that the Latins in applying it to the Holy Ghost in relation to the Son, teach an erroneous and heretical doctrine. Against this imaginary heresy he brought an entire scriptural and patristic armoury into play". This work was written during his last years (895-896). Its effects were mainly posthumous. No less damaging in the long run was his *canonical work* which put the servile condition of the Church with regard to lhe state, on an

[1] *P. G.,* 101-104. — [2] *P. G.,* 103 and 104 as far as col. 956.
[3] Epist. bk. I (24 ep.), [11] (102), ill (67); and 71 ep. in *Amphilochiana,*
[4] *P. G.,* 102, 547-576; and Papadopoulos-Kerameus and Aristarchès Leipzic, 1901 (vol. 2).
[5] *P. G.,* 101, 45-1172, 1277-1296.—[6] *P. G.,* 102, 15-264.
[7] *P. G.,* 102, 279-400. — [8] *P. G.,* 104, 441-976. — [9] *P. G.,* 104, 975-1218.
[10] *P. G.,* 102, 575-584. — See M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 1S4-223.

official footing, and in which, further, he included a number of canons he had introduced in synods that were wholly in his favour. His *letters* met with more immediate results during his lifetime. They arc filled with an unending series of complaints against the Latins, well calculated to strike the popular imagination. He pilloried simple customs, termed them innovations, put them on the same level as the introduction of the *Filioque* in the Creed and held them in equal detestation [1].

The schism, which in the XIth century, separated the Greek Church from Rome was the natural consequence of these calls to rebellion, strengthened by Photius' own example[2].

Photius did not go unanswered. Pope Nicolas I (858-867) asked Hincmar of Rheims [3] to persuade the bishops to write against the reformer. Three of these refutations are still extant [4]:

1. the *Liber adversus græcos* [5] *by* AENEAS OF PARIS (d. 870);
2. the *Contra græcorum opposita*[6] by RATRAMNUS, a monk of Corbie;
3. the *Responsio de fide S. Trinitatis contra Græcorum hæresim* [7], by the German bishops in a meeting at Worms.

Nor was the pope himself slow in answering the treacherous machinations of the Byzantine patriarch, as is witnessed by his *correspondence*[8]* which reveals his solicitude in defending traditional faith and discipline on every side[9]. Pope Adrian II (867-872) went further and caused Photius to be condemned by the *IVth Council of Constantinople,* the Vlllth Oecumenical (869-870), whose acts he approved[10]. His successors continued this work against the Photian error in diverse but less solemn ways.

[1] *Epist. Encyc. ad archiepiscopos Or.* (867); *P. G.,* 102, 721-742. See M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 104-108 and 186. See also *ibid.,* p. 223-224.

[2] Photius knew the primacy of the Roman See and recognised it often enough, though more often he denied it, especially in practice. See M. Jugie on his equivocal attitude, *op. cit.,* p 119-153.

[3] *Epist.* 152. *P. L.,* 119, 1155-1157. The pope mentions 10 complaints, mainly of a disciplinary nature, aired by the Greeks in Bulgaria against the Latins. They obviously come from Photius, although in his Encyclical Letter to the Oriental bishops he enumerates but 6. Cf. M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 104-106.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 186-187. — [5] I2I, 685-762.

[6] *Ibid.,* 225-346. — [7] *Ibid.,* 119, I2O1-I2I2.

[8] *Ibid.,* 769-1200.

[9] See especially his letters to the Emperor Michael (*Ep.* 4, 13, 46, 86, 98); to Photius (12, 99); to the Byzantine clergy (104); and particularly the answer *Ad consulta Bulgaroruni* (97; *P. L.,* 119, 978-1016).

[10] See DENZINGER-B., *Enchiridion,* n. 336-341.

2. Controversies in the West. These had neither the importance nor the grave consequences of the preceding. We must nevertheless give some account of them. They concerned the personality of Christ *(Adoptianism),* predestination, and the Eucharist.

a) The Adoptianism [1] in question was not kin to the Unitarian Adoptianism of the Hird century which denied the Trinity [2], but was similar in practice to Nestorianism. It admitted that the Word was made flesh, but claimed that Christ, by his Incarnation was both Son of God by nature, inasmuch as He was the Word, and adoptive son through His humanity, thus implying that this human nature endowed with a sonship of adoption is also a true person.

Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo (cl. 809) influenced by Nestorian writings[3] appears to have been the author of this doctrine. The chief protagonist of the system however, was Felix OE Urgel (d. 818) a Spanish bishop and a subject of Charlemagne. The latter caused several councils to be held against him, and after 799 kept him at Lyons under the vigilant eye of Archbishop Leidrad, in order to prevent him from falling anew into an error that he had already retracted and embraced on many occasions. He died in the faith, at least in appearance, though he left a doubtful document that was refuted by Leidrad's successor, Agobard. The leading Catholic writer who took part in this controversy was *Alcuin* in his vast and penetrating *Contra Felicem, Urgel. ep., libri VIF.*

b) Predestinatianism [5] was revived in the ixth century by Gottschalk who, between 840 and 860, provoked one of the most violent quarrels ever known in the Church in France and Germany. Inspired by his study of St. Augustine and especially St. Fulgentius, and regarding the letter rather than the spirit, this Saxon monk affirmed (about 848) that there were two absolutely similar *(similiter ommno)* predestinations; that of the good to eternal salvation

[1] See H. QUILLIET, *Adoptianisme,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 408-418. M. JUGIE, *Adopitens,* in *Diet. Hist.,* col. 586-590. J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Doent.*. Ill, p. 526-540.

[2] See vol. 1, p. 175-176.

[3] Probably introduced by means of Arab translations into the circles frequented by Elipandus in the south of Spain.

[4] /.., 101, 119-230. rhe other adversaries of Adoptianism were the monk Beatus O. S. B. (/. *L.,* 96), Bishop Paulinus of Aquilaea (/. *L.,* 99), and Agobard (/< *L.,* 104), who is referred to below.

[5] See E. PortaliÉ, *Augustinisme* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 2527-2530. — Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist, cone.,* iv, 137-235 (Bibliog., p. 13S). — P. Godet, *Gotescale,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1500· 1502.

and of the wicked to hell; he denied God's will to save all men and even human liberty.

HINCMAR of RHEIMS, in whose diocese he was living, had him condemned at the synod of Kiersy-sur-Oise, in 849, and later, also at Kicrsy, promulgated four canons against him, affirming a single predestination, freewill, and God's will to save all men. Men of influence, however, such as Ratramnus, Bishop Prudentius of Troyes, etc., sided with Gottschalk and also perhaps shared his ideas, even to the extent of defending the thesis of two predestinations and causing the Council of Kiersy to be condemned in the councils *of* Valencia, 855. and Langres, 859 a. An attempted reconciliation failed at the synod of Savonnicrcs (859) but succeeded at Tuzey near Tool (860). it may be regarded in the nature of a triumph for the very moderate Augustinism of Hincmar. In any case, the latter's adversaries seem to have quarreled with his terminology rather than his doctrine. But none of t icse controversies, even the liveliest, succeeded in engendering a new and original statement, much less a solution, of this great problem.

c) The Eucharist [3] was closely studied in the ixth century, chiefly [6] by two monks of Corbie, PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS author of a treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini* [4] (written in 831, published in 844), and RATRAMNUS who composed a work under the same title about 859 [5].

Paschasius' book is the first scientific monograph on the Holy Eucharist. Its novelty consisted in explicitly affirming the identity of the historical and Eucharistic Body of Christ, while maintaining a difference as to the mode of existence: the Body of Christ is not in the Eucharist as the Capharnaites understood it to be; His presence is suprasensible and the external appearances *(quodexterius sentitur)* is a figure of the reality perceived by the mind *(interius recte intelligitur aut creditur).* Coming before St. Thomas' metaphysical explanations, this moderate realistic presentation was remarkably precise.

Yet this realism was regarded by some as exaggerated and Ratramnus in his work (of less value) opposed it, claiming that since the Eucharistic Body of Christ was invisible, impalpable and spiritual, it could not be *identical* with His historical, visible and palpable Body; thus, though not denying the Real Presence he accentuated the symbolism of the Eucharist, *Rabanus Maurus* was of the same mind and neither seem to have come so near the truth as Radbertus'.

[1] Scotus Eriugcna intervened at Hincmar's request, but compromised him by his pelagian and rationalist tendencies in his *De pradestinalione,* 851, (*P. L.*, 121) instead of helping him. Hefele-L., *op. cit.*, p. [illegible]

a Hincmar's *De prædestinatione,* written in 859; *P. L.*, 125, 55-474.

[3] See F. Vernet, *L'Eucharistie* (from the ixth to the end of the Xlth cent.) in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1209-1233. P. Heurtevent, *Durand de Troarn,* p. 165-199.

[4] *P. L.*, 120, 1259-1350. — [5] *Ibid.,* 121, 125-170.

[6] To Ralmnus Maurus and some other ixth century authors has been ascribed a vulgar error known as Stercorianism. Though the accusation relies on a number of somewhat disquieting texts it has not yet been shown to be entirely founded. See F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 1224-1226.

By no stretch of imagination can they be regarded as forerunners of the purely symbolic Protestant teaching in the XVIth century. Scotus Eriugcna who also entered the lists was less prudent, like Berengarius in the Xlth century, who started the first true Eucharistic controversy on the Real Presence.

C) The most outstanding men in the IXth century.

Among the men who took part in the controversies just mentioned, three have remained famous: the two archbishops of Lyons and Rheims, Agobard and Hincmar, and Scotus Eriugena.

Agobard [1] Archbishop of Lyons from 816 to 840, a zealous and somewhat hot-headed prelate, was mixed up with all the important happenings of his time. His works includes writings against Spanish Adoptianism, against the Jews, against superstitions, against duelling. Through fear of superstition he also made a moderate attack on the veneration of images. The best part of his work consists in various pastoral treatises written for priests, a writing on morality for the faithful, and several liturgical treatises; the latter are of great value, like those also of Amalarius of Metz, with whom be had some lively passes on liturgical matters. Agobard was less successful when he interfered in the family difficulties of Louis I whom he withstood in various writings. Agobard was a militant bishop and won many victories.

Hincmar [4] (806-882) son of a noble Frankish family, lived at the court of Louis I and Charles II until he was made Archbishop of Rheims in 845. Like Agobard he took a keen interest in all the political events of his time, but this did not prevent him from writing a great deal. We still possess seventy different treatises from his pens. He was at liis best on *canonical* subjects: his learning in these matters was especially shown in his dealings with Lothair in connection with this prince's divorce from Theutberga, and his passage of arms with his nephew and suffragan, Hincmar of Laon, who endeavoured to emancipate the bishops from

[1] See F. Vernet, *ibid.,* 1221-1224.

[3] See M. Besson, *Agobard,* in *Did. Hist.,* col. 998-1001.

[3] *L.,* 104.

[4] M. Netzer, *Hincmar,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 2482-2486. Diverse Monographs: by C. Noorden, Bonn, 1863; LOUPOT, Rheims, 1S69; A. Vidieu, Paris, 1879; H. ScHRORS, Freiburg, 1884; Lesne, Paris, 1905.

[5] *P. L.,* 125-126.

the metropolitan's authority[1]. Even in his relations with Rome we catch a glimpse of his imperious temper. From a *theological* point of view Hincmar helped to establish the veneration of images in Gaul and took an important part in the controversy on predestination[2][3]. Although the Catholics were at one in rejecting Gottschalk's predestinationism, they fell out when it came to explaining the true doctrine: some, with Hincmar took the practical viewpoint and stressed human liberty; others, with Ratramnus, championed the rights of God. Theologically, Hincmar's work on the subject is feeble[3]. Canon law was his strong point and in this he is a true representative of his age.

John Scotus Eriugena[4] probably possessed the most acute and original mind of his time. Very little is known of his life. Born in Ireland or Scotland at the opening of the TXth century, he is found in 847 at the court of Charles the Bald in charge of the palace school. He still held this post when Pope Nicholas I (858-867) warned Charles against his teaching. History remains silent as to the date when he relinquished his scholastic position and the date of his death. It is said that he was murdered by his pupils in an English monastery.

The written work[5][6] of John Scotus Eriugena is fairly considerable. It is doubtful whether he ever composed any special treatise on the *Eucharist*[0] though he certainly held erroneous opinions. His treatise on *predestination* contains original ideas but is not free from inexactitudes[7]. His chief contribution to Western thought was his translation of Dionysius the Areopagite[8] and his great work in 5 books *De divisione natura**, a bold and powerful synthesis. He treats therein: *bk. /: of God* (knowledge of God through affirmative and negative theology; the divine nature, the Trinity) *ID. offirst causes,* i. e., the divine

1 II. Netzer, *Hincmar de Laon,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2486-2478.

9 See above, p. 3S3.

3 See above, p. 383. It was a disordered and obscure compilation of scriptural and patristic texts. His reasoning repeated over and over again in different ways may be reduced to the following: if God predestines the wicked to hell, He Himself is the cause of sin, since it is sin that merits hell. II. Netzer, *op. cit.,* col. 2484. See Hefele-Leclercq, *op. cit.,* p. 220-227.

4 See F. Vernet, *Erigine* or better *Eriugine (/can Scot),* in *Dici, théol.,* col. 401-433·

5 */. L.,* 122, (J. Floss's ed.): to be completed.

6 See R. Heurtevent, *Durand de Troam,* p. 253-285.

' Sec above, p. 382.

For the earlier translation by Ililduin, Abbot of St. Denys see J. DE Ghellinck, *Le mow. théol. au XIP* p. 70-72. 7 '

' *P. L.,* 122, 439-1022.

ideas, or the exemplarism of the Platonist : these ideas are coeternai with the Word and from them the Holy Ghost produces an infinite series of genera, species and individuals : *bk. III on Creation,* of the lower creatures, man and his fall; *bk. IV* and *V : on the return of all things to God;* God as the end of all creation ; the means *of* salvation and the last things. This vast framework includes the majority of theological and religious subjects.

At first sight this work appears imposing. Unfortunately it is not as sound as it looks [1]. Scotus deserves praise for having used *philosophy* in elucidating dogma, but together with his Neoplatonist masters he insisted too much on the Divine transcendence and from this *partial agnosticism* derive all his errors. He was not a rationalist as some have averred, but thoroughly Christian, as is seen from his constant appeals to the authority *of* the Fathers. Nor was *pantheist* in spite of very many apparently pantheistic expressions and a mystical teaching largely concerned with the return to God. He was not even a *heretic* in the true sense, but he was indubitably *heterodox.* Claiming that the Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers were meant for unlettered minds, he allegorised them in his explanations to the extent of disregarding their real meaning; philosophy took its place. Among his errors may be mentioned his doctrine that God is immediately perceptible. His explanation of the pains of hell renders them non-existent. He confused the object of the reason with that of faith, and on this point lagged behind contemporary writers.

In spite of his excellent qualities, Eriugena's attempt to combine speculation with theology had no real practical outcome. His defects proved not only harmful to the author himself but also to the cause they claimed to serve; for the compilers, the *bibliatici,* blamed the method for the writer's mistakes. As a result Theology was destined to follow the positive method for two more centuries. Scotus' influence however did not immediately die with him. The condemnations from the XIIth to the XIIIth century prove that he was still read. Some of these readers remained orthodox; the majority turned to pantheism ; an evident proof that the fountain at which they drank was unhealthy and perhaps entirely poisonous.

THE XIth CENTURY.

We will pass over the Xth century[2] in silence. In a sentence that is famous and only too true, Baronius called it a "Sæculum quod sui asperitate ac boni sterilitate ferreum,

[1] F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 422-426.
[2] J. DE Ghellinck, *Le mouvement thiologique du XIIe* j·., Paris, 1914. P· 29-41·

malique exeuntis deformitate plumbeum, atque inopia scriptorum appellari consuevit obscurum" x. Though it possessed one famous scholar, it had no real writers. Many *schools* still flourished however. A great number of the *monastic schools* founded in the IXth century remained open in spite of the most unfavourable conditions and were equalled and even surpassed in number by the *Cathedral schools.* The French schools particularly began to attract foreign youths. These establishments provided, in addition to a certain classical culture, an elementary dialectic training well calculated to exercise the mind and lay the foundations *of* the philosophical revival of the following centuries. "Theology remained what it had formerly been: an intelligent reading of the Bible and the Holy Fathers, a knowledge of the creeds, the canons and the ritual ceremonies"23

The Xlth century gave greater signs of life, but remained a century of a transition. "The old Benedictine institutions produced a last flicker of light before giving way to the great Cathedral schools "3.

Before we come to the study of the general character of the theology of the period and its most renowned scholars, we will give a short account of a number of famous controversies.

A). Religious controversies.

I. The most famous, and the most serious in its results, was that which led to the Greek schism (1054). It was short but violent : it opened with an arrogant letter written by the bishop, Leo of Achrida, on the instance of MICHAEL CÆRULARIUS4, Patriarch of Constantinople (1043-1054) to John of Irani and the Western episcopate in 10535. This letter condemned the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist and other equally lawful customs (such as the Saturday fast, the eating of'the flesh of strangled animals, the suppression of the alleluia in the Lenten office). Such complaints were typical of this narrow-minded and ambitious patriarch who never lost an opportunity to stir up the hatred

* *Annales eccl.,* a. 900.

3 J. DE GHELLINCK, *op. cit.,* p. 34. — 3 /¿/¿,

* Sce M,cJUGIE' *ThtoL dogmatica Christianorum or.,* p. 101-104, 268-270, 282-284, 298-300, 368-372.

5 *Ad episcopos Francorum et monachos et populos el ad iôsum reverendissimum papam, F. G.,* 120, 835-844. Cf. *P. L.,* 143, 929-932. P

of the Latins among his people. To these he added the more puerile accusations of Photius and embodied them in his *Synodal Edict*[1] and his first letter to the patriarch, Peter of Antioch[2]. The monk NICETAS PECTORATUS[3] contributed with an opusculum against priestly celibacy and other Western uses[4].

Cardinal Humbert, the first of the three legates sent by Leo IX in 1054, successfully refuted him in a *Responsio*[5] whose arguments are usually pointed with personal insults, a regrettable quality, for which the manners of the age and the character of the legate must be blamed. Nicetas openly confessed himself convinced and submitted. Cærularius on the contrary remained obdurate: he persisted in requiring of the pope an explicit recognition of his absolute primacy throughout the East. He and his fellows were excommunicated by Humbert on July 26th 1054[6]. After this date the Greek Church, which after Photius' death had appeared to be seeking anew a complete re-union with Rome[7], gradually fell away. The Oriental controversialists widened the breach by again turning to Photius' writings for both learned and popular arguments, such as had been used with success by Cærularius. Since that time defenders of the unity of the Church have been rare in the East.

2. **Berengarius**[8] (1000-1088) scholiast of St Martin of Tours (about 1040) and archdeacon of Angers, threw France, Italy, and almost the whole of the West into confusion with his new theories on the Eucharist during the second half of the XIth century. He was a dialectician and a pupil of the School of Chartres and claimed to try the truths of faith in the crucible of reason. About 1047 he adopted a thesis entirely opposed to the realist teaching of Paschasius Radbertus whom he charged with ineptitude.

[1] *P. G.*, 120, 735-748.

[2] *P. G.*, 120, 781-796. Witty reply from the patriarch, 795-816.

[3] Works in *P. G.*, 120, 851-1028.

[4] *P. G.*, 120, 1011-1022 (Humbert's answer, 1021-1038).

[5] *P. L.*, 143, 929-1004. (*P. G.*, 120, 1021-1038). Other writings of Card. Humbert are in *P. L.*, 143, 931-1272: *Answer to Leo of Achrida,* a letter *against Berengarius;* three books *against the Sinioniaes.*

[6] See M. JUGIE on this excommunication, *op. cit.*, p. 275-276.

[7] See M. Jugie, *op. cit.*, p. 264-268. S. Vailhe, *op. cit.*, col. 1356-1360.

[8] F. VERNET, *Bérenger de Tours,* in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 722-742; *Eucharistie ibid.*, col. 1217-1219. R. Heurtevent, *Durand de Troam et la controverse birengarienne,* Paris, 1912, p. 119-216.

For his part he denied transubstantiation L He considered that no knowledge can transcend the experience of the senses; he held that "the senses perceive the accidents and the substance at the same time; both being inseparable and differing only by a logical distinction. The eye, perceiving colour, apprehends the thing that is coloured; what is present is visible. That alone exists that can be seen and touched, and only substance that is co-natural to the accident can be seen and touched" 2.

This theory as applied to the Eucharist had a profoundly modifying effect on the traditional teaching. It was immediately denounced to the ecclesiastical authorities and condemned in 1050 in a Roman council by Saint Leo IX. This condemnation was repeated in numerous councils and synods: Vercelli, 1050, Tours, 1054. Florence, 1055, Rouen, 1055 (or 1063). In 1059, under Nicolas II, another Roman council imposed on Berengarius a profession of faith which he accepted; but shortly afterwards he attacked it in his first work; *De sacra cana* (lost). Already at this time various treatises were composed aginst him, notably by three Benedictines, *Durandus of Troarn,* about 1058 3,4*Lanfranc**, between 1063 and 1070 and *Guitmund of Aversa*5, about 1075. There were other polémiste, but Berengarius reserved his attacks for Lanfranc against whom he wrote his second *De cœna sacra* (extant) about 1073. The councils again began to busy themselves with the reformer; at Poitiers, 1074 or 1075, at St. Maixent, 1075 or 1076, and particularly at Rome, 1078 or 1079. The latter, it is said, obtained from Berengarius a final recantation; he accepted a formulary containing an explicit teaching on transubstantiation (except the word itself)6 and the Real Presence.

One of the reasons for the reformer's obstinacy was his misunderstanding of Catholic teaching. He wrongly supposed that the Body of Christ is split up into as many parts7 as there are consecrated altar breads. On the other hand, this teaching had been proposed to him in a way, that from a philosophical point of view8, was vague and sometimes hardly exact. It nevertheless possessed the advantage

* I. e., the idea; the word did not then exist.

8 F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 728-729.

3 *De corpore et sanguine Domini, P. L.,* 149, 1375-1424. See R. Heurtevent, *op. cit.,* p. 217-251.

4 *De corpore et sanguine Domini, P. L.,* 150» 407-442.

5 *De corporis et sanguinis J. C. veritate in eucharistia, P. L.*. 149, 1427-146S.

6 "Confiteor panem et vinum... substantialiter converti in veram et propriam ac viviCicatricem carnem et sanguinem J. C. D. N.". *P. L.,* 148, 811-812. Cf. Denzinger-B., *Ench.,* n. 355.

7 *Portiuncula carnis Christi.* Cf. F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* coi. 1223.

' The profession of faith of the Roman council of 1059 said that the Body of Christ can, " sensualiter, non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri"; such may undoubtedly be the case in a certain sense, but may also be taken in the grossly material meaning that was rejected bv St. Thomas, *Sum. theol.,* III LXVII 6 See F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 733.

of remaining true to tradition, while the expressions of Berengarius were neither philosophically tenable nor in conformity with Christian tradition. At various times he taught impanation '. Elsewhere, speaking of communion, he terms it merely spiritual nourishment.

The question whether Berengarius really denied the Real Presence is still disputed. Until 1059 he does not seem to have done so; but after that date he accentuated the leading ideas of his system to such an extent that everything points to a denial [1]. Many of his followers certainly regarded the Eucharist as no more than a shadow and a symbol [3]. The " Berengarians " however, never formed themselves into a sect and soon gave way before the Catholic defence. This was one result of the controversy. Another was " a marked advance in the explanation of the Eucharistic dogma. The precision and solidity of St. Thomas' treatise on the Eucharist had not yet been attained, but the materials that went to its building were being prepared " [4].

B). Theology. Relations with philosophy.

One of the most remarkable qualities of XIth century theology was the overwhelming importance that was given to Patristic quotations, extracted for the most part from canonical collections[5]. "From this practical angle, usually outside the orbit of the schools, more often in episcopal circles, the first step towards a synthetic development of the accumulated data was destined to be made : here began a series of mutual and advantageous exchanges between the embryonic sciences of medieval theology and canon law"[6]. A typical example of this is to be found in the canonical compilation of Burchard of Worms : " considerable portions, more or less systematised, on theological matters : such as predestination, eschatology, baptism, penance, sacred ceremonies etc.[7]. Following the disputes on investiture the canonical compilations became swollen with new chapters on the conditions of validity of the sacraments and the privileges of the Roman Church; a rich vein that was later

1 Co-existence of the substance of bread and wine with the Body and Blood ef Christ, as the humanity *(caro)* and Divinity co-exist in Christ in the Incarnation.

2 F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 727-737.

3 *Ibid.,* 737.

* *Ibid.,* col. 739.

5 J. de Ghellinck, *Le mouv. thiol, au XIIe s.,* p. 41 sq., 311 sq.

6 *Ibid.,* p. 41-42. —7 *Ibid.,* p. 43.

to be fully exploited in the theological treatises"[1]. The matter of the methodical collections of Patristic texts was accumulated in this way while at the same time was revealed the urgent necessity of conciliating texts that often appeared contradictory, particularly since they were presented in these works entirely isolated from their context[2]. A number of more or less successful attempts at harmonization foreshadowed Abelard's *Sic et non.*

Another characteristic of Xlth century theology was "the passionate antagonism that prevailed between the partisans and adversaries of the use of speculation in dogma, or rather, of dialectics in the explanation of doctrine, for speculation in the true sense of the word did not yet exist"[3]. The most violent adversary of dialectics was St. Peter Damian who had many imitators. "The conflict was bitter: and it must be avowed that there was some justification for suspecting this invasion of dialectics, with its conquering and domineering manners, into the realm of revealed truth. Side by side with trivialities that possessed none of the value of a truly philosophical study of dogma were to be found abuses and excesses that called for prompt suppression"[4]. These were especially noticeable with Berengarius and his followers. They provoked an immediate revulsion and threatened to "compromise for ever the place that can be rightly claimed for human reason in the study of Catholic dogma"[5].

The great controversy on the universals which caused so much intellectual dissension in the Middle Ages also had its repercussion on theology[6]. The problem was already discussed in the ixth century when it was usually solved by the downright affirmation of the objective reality of universals : it was held that the object of our concepts wholly corresponds to something in nature which they reproduce and represent; they are therefore subsisting realities *(subsistentia).* Scotus Eriugena was one of the most enthusiastic propounders of this theory and went so far as to merge all realities in one single being. Others, less hardy, were satisfied with attributing to each genus or species, a real universal essence from which all the individuals of the species derive. The simplicity of this teaching coupled with Eriugena's authority gained

1 *Ibid.,* p. 44. — 3 *Ibid.,* p. 311-338.
3 *Ibid.,* p. 51. — 45*Ibid.,* p. 54.
5 *Ibid.,* p. 56. Among these bold dialecticians may be also mentioned a certain Anselm, named the Peripatetic, an itinerant rhetor who justified only too well the fears of true theologians by the puerilities of his *Rhetorimachia.* See Doemmi.er, *Anselme le P.,* Halle, 1S72.
' M. DE Wulf, *Hist, de la phil. médiévale,* Louvain, 1900, p. 167-189.

it the preference '. Some indeed, such as Odo of Cambrai *, saw in it a reasonable explanation of several dogmas, especially that of the transmission of original sin.

But even in the ixth century, realism had its adversaries. Rabanus Maurus considered the universals to be *nuda intellecta,* pure constructions of the mind. Heirich of Auxerre held the same opinion in the Xth century; but the most illustrious representative of anti-realism was the Breton, Roscelin (1050-1120) a canon of Compïègne where he first taught with great success. He was condemned at Boissons in 1092 and forbidden to teach, but began again later at Tours, Loches, Besançon. He denied that essences were realities and called them mere words : hence the name of nominalism as applied to his somewhat incoherent system. It may be wondered if moderate realism were not the true interpretation of his ideas. In any case, he was rash enough to stress the verbal aspect of universal ideas, and worse still, to apply it to the mystery of the Holy Trinity. Did he in truth teach that there are three gods *(Tritheism)?* It is claimed that he did not: that the error lay in his words rather than in his ideas. He nevertheless affirmed that " in God, the three substances are three separate substances *(res),* like the angels"[3], an expression wholly untenable and heretical, no matter the intention with which they were written[4].

Side by side with this mischievous and clumsy theology there developed in the course of the Xlth century, a type of very orthodox speculation[5] which, though it was bettered by the powerful and original genius of St. Anselm, nevertheless opened the way for him.

C) Some famous ecclesiastical writers of the Xth and Xlth centuries.

Gerbert (935-1003) or Sylvester II[6] (pope, 999-1003) was the most remarkable man of his time. He acquired a world-wide reputation for his scientific learning which was truly prodigious for the period. Born of humble parents at Aurillac, he became head of the episcopal school

1 *Ibid.*, p. 171.
2 In his treatise *De peccalo originali (/. L.,* 160, 1071-i 102), Blessed Odo of Cambrai (d. 1113) supposed that in the persons of our first parents all future generations sinned, since their substance already existed in anticipation in that of Adam and Eve (col. 1079). This author, born at Orleans, who lived for some time at Tournai, has left other interesting writings.
3 According to his adversaries, particularly St. Anselm, *De fide Trinit.,* in. He himself wrote to Abélard: «Non igitur per personam aliud aliquid significamus quam per substantiam, licet ex quadam loquendi consuetudine triplicare soleamus personam, non substantiam ». *L.,* 178, 365.
4 Ilis good faith may be doubled however since he continued to defend his theories even after his condemnation and retractation.
5 See a number of names in J. de Ghellinck, *of. at.,* p. 56-58.
6 Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 1, col. 939 943·

at Rheitns after 991. In 998 he was macle Archbishop of Ravenna and Pope in the following year. He took little interest in theology [1] but commented on all the Aristotelean treatises then known. He seems to have had leanings towards the absolute realism of universal ideas. In his moral teaching he preached "the political subordination of all Christians to the unity of the Church" [2].

St. Fulbert[3] (960-1028) an Italian by birth, Gerbert's pupil at Rheims, came later to Chartres, where he was successively a student (of medicine), professor, and finally bishop in 1007. A friend of Robert the Pious, King of France, he played an important part in the affairs of Church and State and his 123 letters are valuable historical documents. His other writings[4] consist of treatises (against the Jews), sermons and poems. Fulbert was primarily a theologian. He counsels particularly the reading of the Scriptures, the Fathers, the canonists and the liturgists. His theology was positive rather than scholastic. He was nevertheless a philosopher *(acer philosophus).* In the dispute on the universals he leaned towards realism. He cannot, therefore, be blamed for the errors of his pupil, Berengarius[5].

S. Peter Damian[6] (1007-1072) was one of the strongest personalites of the XIth century, one ot the greatest servants of the Church, and, after 1046, the prop of the reforming popes. He became Cardinal Bishop of Ostia in 1057, after having been a monk since 1035. As cardinal he carried on his campaign of reform with even greater energy, since he was now obliged by the duties of his state. He introduced many reforms, accomplished many missions for the popes and revealed in his writings[7] his interest in promoting a more rigorous discipline throughout the Church.

The most important part of his written work consists of the collection of his *letters* (in 8 books)[8]*and a series of 60 *opuscula**, very valuable from a canonical, historical and theological point of view. There are also extant some fifty *sermons*[9], some *lives of the saints*[10], various liturgical and scriptural works and even some poems

Saint Peter Damian was above all a moralist and an ascetic. His harsh and merciless campaign against clerical laxity left him no time for encouraging intellectual culture.

[1] Works in *P. L.,* 139, 85-287. New ed., A. Ollerius, Paris, 1867. The treatise on the Eucharist is of doubtful authenticity.

[3] M. de Wulf, *Hist. ph. mid.,* 1, p. 99-100.

[3] A. Clerval, *Fulbert,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 964-967; *Les écoles de Chartres au M. A.,* Paris, 1895, p. 30-140.

[4] *P. L.,* 141, 189-369. — [5] See above p. 387.

[6] G. Bareille, *Damien (S. Pierre),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 40-45. Dosi R. Biron, 5. *Pierre Damien,* (Coll. *Les Saints),* Paris, 1928.

[7] *P. L.,* 144-145. — [8] 144. 205-498. — [9] *P. L.,* 145, 19-858.

[10] *P. L.,* 144» 5°5 S4S (of the 75 contained in this edition 19 were not written bv St. Peter Damian).

[11] *P. L.,* 144, 925-1°32. — [12] *P. L.,* 145, 861-986.

He firmly opposed the introduction of dialectics into theology. He appears to have admitted no philosophy other than the faith; he looked upon the rest as "worldly, beastly, devilish" and considered the fine arts to be mere foolishness[1]. Such prejudices, only to be explained by his special vocation, were obviously unfavourable to theological speculation. The influence of the holy cardinal was felt in other spheres and amply merited for him the title of Doctor[2].

Blessed Lanfranc[3] (1005-1089) a native of Pavia, was first a lawyer, then professor of law and literature at Avranches, before becoming a monk at Bee about 1042. Three years later he became prior and head of the monastery school. In 1063 he was made abbot of the monastery of St. Stephen at Caen and in 1070 was named Archbishop of Canterbury by William the Conqueror who was always very amenable to his influence. Lanfranc's fame was earned for him in the school of Bee to which he attracted many students and which was later to be the home of the great St. Anselm. His written work[4] consists mainly of a commentary on all St. Paul's epistles, a treatise on the Eucharist against Berengarius[5], a short work on the seal of the confessional, various monastic ordinances and 44 short letters. As a *theologian* Lanfranc remained faithful to the old methods, suspicious of a too large use of philosophy in theology. Nevertheless, at a time when the orthodox and sure speculative methods of St. Anselm and St. Thomas were still to come and, while rash speculation still abounded, he stood out as an eminent theologian, a witness to tradition giving due reverence to the Divine mysteries.

1 *De sancta simplicitate,* 5. *P. L.,* 145, 861-986.

2 Title given to him by Pope læo XII in 1828.

3 E. Amann and Λ. Gaudel, *Lanfranc,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 2558-2570.

4 *P. L.,* 150, 101-516.

5 *Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini adversus Berengarium, P. I..,* 150, 407-442. This is Lanfranc's principal work: see *Did. théol., loe. cit.,* col. 2565-2569. Cf. above, p. 38S.

CHAPTER II.

Saint Anselm of Canterbury.

Special Bibliography :

Editions: T'. Z., 158-159 (Gerberon's edit., 1675). Studies: P. Ragey, *Hist, de S. Anselme,* Paris, 1890. Ch. de RÉMUSAT, 5. *Anselme de Cantorbéry,* Paris 1853. Ch. de Montalembert, *Les moines d'Occident.,* vol VII (Paris, 1877), 174-315. A. Moehler, *Anselm Erz btschofvon Canterbury,* Tubingen, 1827. Card. d'Aguirre, 5. *Anseimi theologia,* 3 vols, Salamanca, 1678-1681. J. Bainvel, *Anselme de Cantorbéry* (saint) in *Did. théol.,* col. 1327-1350; *Anselme (argument de saint), ibid.,* col. 1350-1360. P. Richard, *Anselme de C.* in *Diet. Hist.,* col. 464-485. J. Riviere, *Le dogme de la Rédemption,* p. 291-323. A. van Weddingen, *Essai critique sur la philos, de S. Anselme,* Brussels, 1875 (VI) 4°8· DOMET de Vorges, 5. *Anselme* (Coll. *Les Grands Philosophes)* Paris, 1901. M. Filliatre, *La philosophie de S. Anselme,* Paris, 1920. A. KoyrÉ, *Didée de Dieu dans S. Anselme,* Paris, 1923: on these two works see M. de Wulf, *Revue néo-scol.,* 1923, p. 443-445. E. Gilson. *Laphil. au M. A.,* l, p. 41-46. M. Grabmann, *Die Gesch. der schol. Methode,* l, p. 258-339. Th. Heitz, *Les rapports entre la phil. et la foi,* p. 52-64. Dom A. WiLMART, *La tradition des prières de S. Anselme,* in *Revue bénéd.,* 1924 (vol. 36), p. 52-71. *Revue de philosophie,* December 1909 (entirely devoted to St. Anselm).

LIFE (1033 or 1034-1109).

Born at Aosta in Piedmont of Lombard parents, both of whom were of noble birth, Anselm dreamed as a child of finding God, Whom he imagined as dwelling on the tops of the mountains whose snow-clad summits overhung the valley where he lived L His dream was to be fulfilled in a mystical way in later years. In his early youth he loved study and prayer, but when he came to the age of fifteen he began to grow lax and after his mother's death, "having lost his anchor he was left to the mercy of the waves " says his biographer Eadmer 2. Suffering and hardship however worked a change of heart.

After his mother's death, his father, though a good man and destined to die as a religious, began to treat him harshly. There came a time when the boy, no longer able to bear the misery of being continually

' by Eadmer — 2 *Ibid.,* 4, col. 52.

blamed, ran away from home. After three years spent in Burgundy and France, he came into Normandy (at Avranches) and attracted by Lanfranc's fame made his home at Bee. His childhood idea of becoming a monk was born again ; but he was unable to make up his mind to stay at Bee for fear of being overshadowed by Lanfranc. Cluny he ruled out since no studies were done there. Soon however the touch of grace swept away all worldly considerations. He became a monk of the Abbey of Bee. "There", he said "shall be my resting place; there, shall I seek God alone; there, all my contemplation shall be in loving Him; there, the blessed and unending recollection of Him shall be my consolation and contentment". Before his final decision, however, he went to consult the Bishop of Rouen; an action that is finely analysed by Bainvel: " It shows that this man of great ideals and deep feeling, this unaffected and impulsive soul, could, when necessary, be practical and circumspect" '.

Anselm entered the monastery in 1060. He was then twenty seven years old. Three years later, when Lanfranc went to found St. Stephen's of Caen he became prior, the right arm of the abbot whom he succeeded in 1078. He remained head of the monastery until he was torn away from his beloved solitude and raised to the See of Canterbury in 1093. More than thirty years of his life were thus spent at Bec. I hey were fruitful years. The time that was not taken up by' his duties as prior and scholiast was given to prayer and the study'· of sacred learning. His renown as a teacher of theology spread far and wide and drew ever increasing numbers of young students from other lands to the Abbey of Bee. He enjoyed the reputation of being an unrivalled educator of the young as well as a brilliant professor. I he secret of his success and his greatest virtue lay in his gentleness.

His mode of life is revealed in the writings he composed during this period -. A considerable number of his letters (130 out of a total of about 400) date from this time. I hey portray him, both as prior and abbot, busily occupying himself with dogmatic and moral theological subjects and canon law, what time he was not giving little familiar exhortations to his monks, Ihe majority of his treatises reveal the *accomplished theologian;* the only exception is a treatise on pure philosophy3, a model of its kind. Diverse opuscula in dialogue form treat of theological matters4.

But the best works written by Anselm before he became bishop, are the *Monologton* and the *Proslogton.* One day, in conversation, having spoken of meditation on the Divine essence and kindred subjects, he was asked by the monks to write it down. This he did,

' J. Bainvel, *op. cit.,* col. 1328.
2 See below, p. 398 sq. — 3 *De grammatico,*
4 *De veritate, De libero arbitrio, De casa diaboli.*

to the great contentment of the majority. It was little to Lanfranc's taste, however; he was appalled at "this invasion *of* reason into the realm of faith". Anselm did not allow himself to be shaken, but on the contrary rounded off his work by putting in the place of the series of arguments which makes up the *Monologion,* one single argument that of itself suffices to show that God is what He is, the Sovereign Good; this prayerful study was the *Proslogion.* The *a priori* proof of the existence of God met with criticism from Gaunilo, a monk of Marmoutiers, but Anselm stuck to his position and again affirmed that it is possible to pass from the ideal to the real when God, and He alone, is in question. We may be certain that when he wrote this, he little thought he was setting a problem that would divide the greatest minds for centuries to come [1].

Anselm also engaged in another controversy with *Roscelin,* whom he refuted in a great treatise, "De fide Trinitatis". The work was begun at Bee; interrupted by Roscelin's submission in 1092, and completed by the new Archbishop of Canterbury when Roscelin again fell into error.

Anselm was named Archbishop of Canterbury in 1093. William Rufus would not agree to this choice until four years after Lanfranc's death, when, stricken by illness, he himself lay at death's door. No sooner was he cured, than he repented of his decision, for Anselm, following the example given by Gregory VII had set his face resolutely against lay investiture and the claims of his king. The bishops cajoled him and then openly resisted him, but nothing would make him yield. In 1097 he judged it prudent to leave the country. He awaited God's good time in Italy and Gaul, interesting himself meanwhile in the general work of reform [2] at the council of Bari in 1099. During his stay at Cluny about 1100 he gave a lecture on the beatitude of heaven of which several of the monks' versions are still extant [3]. In Italy he finished his great treatise on the reasons for the Incarnation *(Cur Deus homo)* to which he added a pendant while living at Lyons "on the virgin birth of Christ and original sin [4]. While at Bari he had also refuted the Trinitarian theories of the Greeks in an extant writing "on the procession of the Holy Ghost".

Recalled to England after William's death by Henry I (1100-1131) he again fell foul of the king over lay investiture. In 1103 he trod anew the exile's path, this time to Rome. He returned three years later (1106) when the king had

1 See below, p. 400 and p. 404 sq.
2 See bis skirmishes with William, Richard, *op. cit.,* col. 470-47·'
3 See below, p. 401. — 4 See below, p. 403.

finally given satisfaction to the Archbishop and to Rome 1. This time the truce was to endure. But Saint Anselm was coining to the end of his days. His mind continued in meditation to the last2; he had but one regret on his deathbed; to have left unsolved the problem of the origin of the soul. He died on April 21st 1109 at the age of seventy-six.

Saint Anselm is one of the most lovable men to be found in the History of the Church. He himself seemed to be aware of it : " All the good people who have known me have loved me; those especially who knew me best " 3. His correspondence proves that his appeal lay in his *goodness* no less than in his powerful genius for speculation. It needed all William's brutality and the bitterness of the religious strife of the time to embroil him in a quarrel with his sovereigns. Modern readers of his works are still captured by his great charm, even protestants and free-thinkers. BainveU who makes this observation attributes it partly to his rare gifts as an artist and a writer but also to the care he takes to enter into contact with the reader by means of an unaffected and friendly word at the beginning or end of his work. " Throughout his works ", says another writers, "we discover a soul that is charming, grave and serene, full of tenderness and kindness, the soul of a great thinker, a mystic, a saint ", But this gentleness did not prevent Anselm from being an unconquerable defender of the rights of the Church whenever he saw them attacked; and the example he set us then, still lives. It as a Doctor, however, that he possesses the most interest for us here. His written work stands in the first rank.

II. WORKS.

Saint Anselm was outstandingly a writer of monographs. He composed no Summa on theology as a whole; but to the principal theological questions he devoted a series of studies which, though usually brief, are of admirable depth. Several of them mark a date in the history of theology. They treat of *religious philosophy, of God,* of the *Trinity,* of *Christ* and

1 Sec Richard, *ibid.,* 473-476.
2 As witness his treatise *De concordia,* which dates from his last days.
3 *Op. cit.,* col. 134Ï-1342. — Koyre, *op. cit.,* p. 5.

His work. To these may be added diverse *opuscula* and a vast *correspondence.*

A). Christian Philosophy.

1. The De grammatico [1] is not, as may at first appear, a simple exercise in logic; it consists of an introduction to the study of Aristotle's categories (for Anselm knew his Aristotle) and an initiation to dialectics, the antechamber of theology.

2. The dialogue, De veritate[2,3] in spite of its obscurities is of much greater importance. After having demonstrated that God is the Supreme Truth, Anselm distinguishes logical truth *(veritas enuntiationis)* from moral truth *(rectitudo voluntatis* or *veritas actionis)* and still more from ontological truth *(veritas essentice rerum).* Truth in general is defined "*Rectitudo sola mente perceptibilis*", and thus differs from justice which is "*Rectitudo voluntatis servata propter se*"\ Anselm shows that since partial truths are found in created beings there must exist an absolute subsisting truth, rectitude and justice; and this is God[4].*

3. The dialogue De libero arbitrios deals mainly with the relation of freewill to the moral act. Anselm was careful not to include within its connotation the power of evil-doing, and defined it; "The power of preserving the rectitude of the will for the sake of rectitude itself"[6]; he goes on to show' that it is proper to God, to the angels and finally to men in their present state, as well as in their primitive state of innocence, whether they yield to evil or overcome it. The subject is treated with great acuity; the author however does not distinguish *free* acts from *voluntary* acts as exactly as do modern theologians who thus guard against the errors of Bains and Luther who confused these two ideas, wrongly invoking Anselm's authority.

B). Treatises on God.

I. The Monologion [7] is a rational explanation in 79 chapters of Christian teaching on the Divine Nature (ch. I-29) and the Trinity (ch. 30-76). The author first proves that there exists a God, the sovereign good, the supreme cause and perfect being (ch. I and 4); he shows

[1] *P. L.,* 158, 561-582. —[2] *P. L., ibid..* 467-486.
[3] *P. L.,* 158, 480, 484: ch. II (truth), ch. 12 (justice).

[4] Saint Thomas used and completed Anselm's ideas. He gave a more exact definition of truth. *De veritate.* q. 1; *Sunt, theol..* I q. xvi

[5] *P. L..* 158, 489-506.

[6] Potestas servandi rectitudinem voluntatis propter ipsam rectitudinem c. t.

that all other beings besides God, are *per ilium* and *ex nihilo*, while God alone is *per se* and *ex se* and cause of all things (ch. 5-11); he then explains the perfections of this sovereign substance *(summa substantia)* considering it in itself and in its relations with other beings (ch. 12-29). Coming immediately to the Trinitarian dogma he develops the theology of the *Word* as the creative word, but more especially as the eternal Word (ch. 30-48); of the *Holy Ghost* who proceeds by the way of love from the Father and the Word (49-58) and lastly of the three *Persons* together (59-76), with a magnificent peroration to show that man can, and must, love these three divine Persons. Chapters 77-79 may be regarded as a conclusion: we must believe with a living faith, i. e., animated by charity (77), in these three Persons Who are the supreme essence, which is God, "summe bonus et summe potens Spiritus, qui solus dominatur omnia in omnibus". The Monologion is one of the most powerful rational expositions of the Divine nature that have ever been written.

2. The Proslogion[1] is yet more famous than the Monologion, of which it was the complement *(Alloquium)*. It had for subtitle: *Fides queerens intellectum;* an expression which has become the motto of scholasticism and plainly indicates the purpose of this work. In a brief *preamble* Anselm explains that in order to prove God's existence and explain His nature, he has found a single argument sufficient to take the place of the long demonstrations contained in the Monologion. This argument he places in the mouth of a Christian "endeavouring to uplift his mind to the contemplation of God and seeking to understand what he believes"[2]. And in consequence the treatise opens with a long and splendid *prayer* in which the author asks for supernatural light in order to understand what he believes (ch. I). In chapters 2 and 3, the author gives his argument *a priori* (called the argument of St. Anselm) for the existence of God, and in the remainder of the work he goes on to develop a magnificent synthesis of the Divine attributes.

Whatever may be the philosophical value of chapters 2 and 3, it must be admitted that the work as a whole possesses great doctrinal

[1] *P. L.,* 158, 223-242.

[2] Sub persona conantis erigere mentem suam ad contemplandum Deum, et quærentis intelligere quod credit, subditum scripsi opusculum.

importance «and still retains its theological and mystical value; as the author himself says in his preamble, it consists in a beautiful contemplative meditation. The transports of enlightened faith, the pure accents of love that animate these pages show that the auther as he wrote them possessed that limpid and truly realist ide«a of God which is a fruit of the supernatural wisdom which is added to, and perfects charity'. The work is undoubtedly well calculated to raise the soul to a state of contemplation by making it feel, and understand in a practical manner *what* God is. But as for proving to the fool *that God exists,* the argument hardly appears adequate (ch. 2 and 3) '. The author seems to have been too sanguine. Anselm's idea of God is indubitably extremely spiritual and also very realist, precisely because it is mystical: and it is easy to understand that he was led to realise it in some manner in his argument by passing from the ideal to the real; bin his mysticism instead of strengthening the *universal dialectic value of* his demonstration renders it inherently weak. For the mystic, the realism of the idea of God derives not so much from its own content as from the gift of wisdom which, as it were, makes the idea sensibly perceptible to the mystic himself. Though it is doubtful, therefore, that the Proslogion may ever convince the fool or even reasoning believers such as Gaunilo, it is well designed to afford increasing conviction to the contemplative believer[3] such as Anselm, of the foolishness of the atheist, since it disposes him to perceive the reality of the "Being, than Whom no greater is conceivable". From this point of view the work is immensely valuable and therein perhaps lies the fruit that the author, possibly unwittingly, expected to reap from his treatise and his defence of it against the clever and perspicacious attacks of Gaunilo[45]

B). The De concordias is St. Anselm's last writing[6.7] In this work he discusses some of the most thorny questions of philosophy and theology; of the harmony that exists between our freewill and God's foreknowledge, predestination and finally grace. lie treats the subject methodically and with great clarity[7] like a true disciple of St. Augustine intent on safeguarding the independence and sovereign rights of God, but always with his characteristic moderation.

1 See vol. 1, p. 23.

3 See below, p. 40S.

3 I. e, the contemplative who in practice applies himself to contemplation (preamble) rather than to rigid reasoning as does St. Thomas in the Summa. (See l>elow, p. 576).

4 If one can judge from the preamble, chapter I and the remainder of the work except chapters 2 and 3.

s 7< £., 158, 507-542.

5 He says that he is happy to have understood something of these matters through the grace of God *(non ego sed gratia Dei mecum)* and happy to be able to share his discoveries : *quod gratis accepi gratis -volui petentibus impendere,* c. 24.

'Foreknowledge, ch. 1-7; predestination, ch. 8-10; grace, ch. 11-23. Conclusion ch. 24. æ

C). Treatises on the Holy Trinity.

1. The De fide Trinitatis[1] is a polemical work against Roscelin. Anselm first shows how absurd it is to make faith subject to reason; the inverse process is more correct, for the true theologian should begin with the Scriptures (ch. 1-2). He goes on to refute Roscelin by solving his difficulties, mainly by means of exact definitions of *nature* and *person* and careful distinctions between the *absolute* and the *relative.* He treats of the Incarnation merely in passing, in spite of the title of the work[2].

2. The De processione Spiritus Sancti contra G-ræcos[3], is one of the first great Latin treatises composed in rebuttal of the Greek teaching that was becoming more and more widespread, especially- after the Xlth century[4]. Anselm's demonstration is vigorous and closely- knit. Beginning with general notions on the Trinity (ch. 1-3), he shows that the Holy Ghost must proceed not only from the Father but from the Son (ch. 4-7), first alleging the Scriptures (8-12) and then replying to various objections, either on the doctrine itself (ch. 13-21) or on the addition of the *Filioque* to the Creed (ch. 22). The last chapters (23-39) form a kind of summary of his argument and an additional proof. It should be noticed that Anselm did not approve of those expressions that state that the Holy Ghost proceeds *principaliter* from the Father (ch. 24), or proceeds from the Father *per Filium* (ch. 15, 16). These expressions are admittedly equivocal, but are nevertheless susceptible of right interpretation[5].

D). Treatise on evil and the Redemption.

1. The dialogue De casu diaboli[6] is a fuller treatment of a subject that is touched upon in the *De libero arbitrio* and the *De Concordia.* Anselm explains the origin and the nature of evil with reference to the fallen angels. Since many of his observations are equally' applicable to man; the work opens up a wide field and serves as an introduction to Anselm's masterpiece, the *Cur Deus homo.*

2. The Cur Deus homo[7] is, in the true sense of the word, the first treatise on the Redemption. It is a masterly exposition of a theory of satisfaction which, with slight modifications, was to become, "the classical theological doctrine in this matter"[8]. The work is written in the form

* *P. L., ibid.,* 259-284.

3 *Defide 'Prinitatis et de Incarnatione Ieròi.*

3 *P. L., ibid.,* 285-326.

4 See above, p. 379 and p. 384.

5 See above, p. 378.

6 *P. L., ibid,,* 325-360.

7 *P. L., ibid.,* 359-432. Analysis in J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption,* p. 292-303.

8 J. Rivière, *ibid.,* p. 291.

of a dialogue between Anselm and his disciple Boso. Jt contains two books.

In the first book it is established, as the author himself states, (preface), that the Christian dogma of the Redemption is wholly reasonable and "necessary reasons prove" *that man cannot possibly save himself by himself.* The book may be divided into three parts. After an introduction in which it is recalled that the comprehension of so great a mystery supposes faith (ch. 1-2) the author replies to various current *objections* regarding the Incarnation (ch. 3-10), shewing, as an instance, that an angel could not redeem us (ch. 5), that the devil possessed no rights over mankind (ch. 7). He then proves exhaustively the necessity of *satisfaction* for sin (ch. 11-19) : to leave sin unpunished would upset the balance of order, putting the just man and the sinner on the same footing: God is bound to require the honour that is His due (12-13); His imprescriptible rights exact punishment for sin (14-15); further, since the divine plan must be realised (16-18) and nothing impure may enter heaven, the need of satisfaction is evident (19). But *man is powerless* to give satisfaction (ch. 20-25); because God already possesses the right to all man's homage [1](20); in addition, sin is an infinite offence and as such man alone cannot repair it[2](21); again, man can no more spoil the devil of his prey than he can restore to God what He has lost (23). Pure and simple pardon is inconceivable both on the part of God and man (24). It must be concluded that there is no salvation for mankind when left to its own resources: it can only be saved through a Divine redemption; this forms the subject of the following book.

The second book provides the positive side of the thesis, and proves, says lhe author in the preface, that since man was made to enjoy immortal happiness both in soul and body, he must necessarily attain this end : and must therefore be redeemed by the Man-God. This thesis of the *necessity of satisfaction by the Man-God* is mainly established in chapters 4-9 : God is bound to save us, not because of any internal necessity, but because He willed our final end when he created us (4-5); on the other hand, eternal salvation implies a complete satisfaction : it follows that it must be given by a Man God (6); this Saviour must be a perfect God and a perfect man (7), sprung from Adam and born of a Virgin (8), in short, the Word (9). The conclusion shows the *efficacy* of lhe work of Redemption. Christ was able to merit for us, since He was beholden to no other than Himself for His righteousness (10); He died voluntarily (11, 17-19) in order to give us a model by satisfying God for sin (11-13); the efficacy of His death extends to all (14-16). We who are the brethren of Christ are able to share in His redemption (20); the devils have no part in it (22).

The *Cur Deus homo,* notwithstanding a few defects [3], is one of the most penetrating and thoughtful works in the history of Christian speculation; "a work of capital importance, both on account of its originality and its influence, it has earned St. .Anselm a place beside the greatest Fathers of the Church. The power of its conception and strength of execution still make it the most able, if not the most comprehensive work on the mystery of the Redemption, in all Christian literature" [4].

[1] A reason more plausible than adequate; see J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 298.

[2] The author entirely neglects the hypothesis of the partial repentance and satisfaction acceptable to God.

[3] See below, p. 410.

3. The De conceptu virginali et originali peccato[1] deals with a subject that is touched upon in the *Cur Deus homo.* Anselm explains in the latter work that Christ, being born of a pure virgin could not have original sin (bk it, 18). In the present work he explains the nature of original sin and the manner of its transmission. Without entirely identifying original sin with concupiscence[2], he admits, like the majority of contemporary theologians that natural generation is the normal condition for the transmission of original sin. As a consequence, Christ born of a virgin, would have been exempt, even had Mary possessed original sin at the time of the birth of the Saviour. But it was altogether more becoming, both for God the Father, and the Son, that Mary should have been wholly unstained : *Decens erat ut ea puntate qua major sub Deo nequit intclligi Virgo illa niteret*[3].

E) Various other writings.

lhe authenticity of the remainder of Anselm's work is less well established and requires further critical study.

1. Opuscula. Some ten opuscula would seem to be his work. They treat either of theology and philosophy: *De voluntate, De azymo et fermentato, De sacramentorum diversitate*[3], and also *De malo* and *De corpore et sanguine Christi*[6][8] or canonical and pastoral questions: *Offendiculum sacerdotum, De nuptiis consanguineorum, Admonitio monenti*[7], *fudicium de stabilitate monachi*[8]. To these may be added shorthand records of lectures and conversations: *De beatitudine calestts patria, De similitudinibus*[9], *De pace et concordia*[10]. The authenticity of other opuscula published under his name, and especially those on ascetic subjects, is extremely doubtful [11].

2. Homilies,[12] 16 are published under his name, but the 9th alone is well guaranteed. The remainder are doubtful.

[1] J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 291.

[2] *P. L.,* 158, 431-464.

[3] *De conceptu,* 4; col. 437. *De concordia,* 8; col. 530 sq.

[4] *De conceptu.* See below, p. 411.

[5] *P. L.,* 158, 487-490; 541-548; 551-554.

[6] Among his letters: 11, 8; iv, 107.

[7] *P. L., ibid.,* 555-556; 557-560; 685-688.

[8] *P.* 159, 333-335.

[9] *Ibid.,* 587-606; 605-708.

[10] *P. L.,* 158, 1015-1021.

[11] In *P. L.,* 158 for the most part.

[12] *P. L.,* 158, 585-647

3. Meditations [*]. It is known that Anselm composed many meditations at various times, but of the 21 that bear his name only three (2, 3, ri) according to the early manuscripts would appear to be his, in addition to the Proslogion. The others are due to many pens and were brought together at a later date in a single collection. According to Fr. Bainvel', they imitate "the Anselmian manner oí developing ideas and feelings like an incoming tide, and of combining speculative thought with loving prayer"[3]

4. Prayers (Orationes)[4]. There exist 75 in the present collection but some twenty only are St. Anselm's[5]. All the critics are unanimous in praising the nobility of their thought and feeling. The rhythmical pieces, 40 and 61, must be rejected. Moreover it is probable that none of the poems ascribed to S. Anselm are authentic, nor even the fine mediaeval collection of hymns to Mary, entitled *Mariale*[6].

5. Letters. St. Anselm's correspondence contains 447 letters, divided into 4 books[7]. They possess considerable interest both from an historical and doctrinal point of view. Some are veritable theological opuscula. A large number contain precious ascetic exhortations or spiritual counsel. All bear witness to the illustrious doctor's exquisite tact, no less remarkable than his eminent and wide learning.[2]

III. THE DOCTOR AND HIS TEACHING.

A). The Doctor[8].

St. Anselm was the first true Christian thinker of the Middle Ages. He opened new avenues to speculation, nor can his boldness be qualified as rashness, for no one possessed a greater love for the early Patristic tradition, which ever remained the chief source of his inspiration. The strength he found therein was incremented by the unfailing Christian and theological instinct that the habit of contemplation kindled in his mystical soul[9]. This trait as well as the number of his doctrinal works attach Anselm

[1] *P. L.*, 158, 709-820. The meditation on the *Miserere* (*P. L.*, 158, 821-854) is disputed. On these meditations see Dom Wilmart, *Pev. bin.*, 1924, p. 52-71.

[2] J. Bainvel, *op. eit.*, col. 1333.

[3] Several "Anselmian" meditations are quite mistakenly ascribed to St. Augustine.

[*] *P. L.*, 158, 855-1016. See Dom Wilmart, *ibid.*

[5] Numbers, 9, 20, 23, 24, 34, 41, 50, 51, 52, 63, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 74, 75. See Dom Wilmart, *ibid.*

[6] Re-edited by Ragey wbo defends their authenticity. London, 1SS3.

[7] *P. L.*, 158, 1059-1208.

[8] See J. Bainvel, *op. cit.*, col. 1343-1344.

to the Augustinian schoolr, of which he is one of the most outstanding figures.

Anselm's method was entirely opposed to the conscious or unconscious rationalism of Berengarius and Roscelin which narrowed down the sphere of faith in obedience to the supposed claims of reason. Anselm begins by clearly setting out the foundation of revealed truth on which the edifice of reason is to be built and unlike those " dialecticians" who placed undue confidence in their skill he asks the believer to live his faith[2]. According to the treatise on the Trinity, only the faith *that is lived,* obeyed and practised can give the Christian thinker the "spiritual wings" on which he may soar: faith purifies the heart; keeping the commandments enlightens the soul; humble obedience makes us little and able to receive wisdom ; in order to understand spiritual realities we must live according to the spirit[3]. And St. Anselm summarises this typical Augustinian teaching thus: " Qui non crediderit non intelliget. Nam qui non crediderit *non experietur,* et qui non expertus fuerit non intelliget". As we know, the Christian life is able by means of the *mystical graces* to know this "experience" of the supernatural which sheds so much light on its object. All the present context calls for this interpretation[4]. At the beginning of the *Cur Deus homo* Anselm explicitly associates the understanding with contemplation[5]. He practised what he preached. This is finely exemplified in the *Proslogion* whose entire quality proves that the reason why the author sought God with such ardour and clear-sightedness was because his soul had already found its rest in Him through charity and wisdom.

This affective and mystical foundation of Anselm's method, far from being an obstacle to the free play *of* reason seems on the contrary to favour it. Anselm seeks *to understand the mysteries* and revealed truth with an insatiable desire: his whole work bears witness to this fact and he himself repeats it. His purpose is to penetrate the fastnesses of revealed truth, and though he may be unable to uncover their most profound secrets, he means to seize on as much as his slate permits. It is possible that he places loo much trust in reason which he envisages as "supernaturalised" and borne up by the " spiritual wings" of practical faith. Consequently he neglects to define the limits of reason not only in his *a priori* argument for the existence of God, but also in his explanation of the motives of the Incarnation and even to some extent in his study of the Trinity[6]. In accordance with the current formula of his time he seeks the "*necessary reasons*" of the

' *Ibid.,* p. 665 sq.

2 See especially all ch. 11 of the *Defide Trinitatis:* col. 263-265.

3 All this is repeated insistently *(prius..., prius..., prius...)* as a preliminary condition of speculative effort.

4 The requisite moral conditions lead up to a wholly supernatural enlightenment which perfects the faith. No natural voluntarism therefore is in question.

s *Op. cit.,* I, ch. i: "Eorum quæ credunt intellectu et contemplatione delectentur". Nor is it entirely necessary that the word *contemplation* should here bear the strict meaning of an exclusively mystical grace.

6 Sec Th. Heitz, *Les rapports de la raison et de la foi,* Paris, 1919, p. 519. J. Bainvel, *op. cit.,* col. 1545-1546.

mysteries *(necessaria rationes)* showing himself more anxious to fall in with the intellectual aims of his contemporaries than to reduce them to their proper perspective. Nevertheless the reasons he finds are usually extremely elevated since they are considered from the divine angle. Anselm is thus pre-eminently a " metaphysician of dogma"[1]. With him metaphysics found its place in theology ; a place it was never to relinquish, particularly after St. Thomas so skilfully incorporated the work of the Archbishop of Canterbury in his Summa.

Saint Anselm combined with his gifts of a metaphysician a remarkable dialectical faculty. Though his reasoning is usually "less intricate and more free than that of Saint Thomas, it is not the less close and rigorous", says Bainvel[3]. " Possibly in no other scholastic author may be found such exhaustive reasoning or series of deductions so well adapted to draw out of a principle or a revealed truth everything reason can lay hold of". The same author judges that St. Anselm's method surpasses that of St. Thomas as a "research method". Starting from a principle, he pursues, as it were, the thread of reasoning until the end. Hence a great unity in development and a certain spaciousness in the dialectic progression. The *Monologion* is the model ; the *Cur Deus homo* follows a very similar course. They are " voyages of discovery". St. Thomas was not unacquainted with this method, but with St. Anselm it is more striking, possibly on account of the monographic nature of his writings which enabled him to set his own limits to his subject, both as regards matter and length. The mere fact that Anselm can be compared with St. Thomas shows the excellence of his dialectic.

Saint Anselm is rightly considered as the founder of scholasticism [3], i. e., of *scholastic theology,* and also indirectly of *scholastic philosophy* which was then so closely associated with it [4]. Like the true Christian thinker that he was, St. Anselm stated the principle that there can be no contradiction between truths known by revelation and the certain data of reason : natural truth cannot be opposed to supernatural truth. On the contrary, they must be in agreement and harmony. This accord must and can be discovered by reason. No one was more aware of this obligation than St. Anselm and the immortal device of his *Proslogion* FIDES QUÆRENS INTELLECTUM became that of all scholasticism. But in addition to his motto he bequeathed to the scholastics his splendid confidence in reason and bold speculation, his taste for metaphysics and solutions deduced from the highest principles that the mind can comprehend, and lastly a zeal for the use of dialectics, which, in prudent hands, is a powerful instrument of good.

[1] J. de Ghellinck, *Le moicu. théol.* au XIIe s., p. 59-60.
[3] *Op. cit.,* col. 1343.
[3] M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* p. 263 sq.
[4] Sec above, p. 367.

The powerful originality of Anselm's work is emphasised by the fact that nothing of the kind is to be found in previous centuries. It was not the natural fruit of long preparation. The genius of St. Anselm enabled the human mind to affect a prodigious and sudden advance and it is undoubtedly due to this unrivalled superiority of his powers that his influence was not wholly felt before the end of the Xllth century. "Neither his treatises nor his doctrines seem to have penetrated the schools immediately... We have to await the XHIth century before seeing the introduction of the *Philosophus Christi*[1] into the schools. Until then, his writings were snatched still wet from the author's pen or that of his secretaries, and greedily studied, as may be seen from the early catalogues. They silently spread abroad the fame of the great doctor and contributed in a large measure to the intellectual growth which gathered force throughout the Xllth century"[2]. St. Anselm's influence, especially as regards general method, gradually became immense. He nevertheless left his mark on several special theological questions as will be seen below.

B). Teaching.

I. The existence of God. This is usually established by Anselm by means of *the degrees of perfection,* a method customary with St. Augustine[3], which he employs with remarkable intellectual vigour. He supposes that all who possess a clear idea of being, will admit this *principle:* to possess incompletely a perfection is to share the same absolute perfection. He applies this principle to sensible realities and his demonstration no matter how idealist it may appear at first sight, is based on a very concrete foundation. His proofs are to be found at the beginning of the *Monologion* (ch. 1-4) in passages that are rightly claimed to be the most closely reasoned and profound ever written by the great doctor.

His demonstration appears to follow a threefold course.

The first is based on the *properties of beings,* such as goodness and greatness (ch. 1-2). We perceive a great number of beings possessing different degrees of goodness. This can only be explained by their participation in some single and sovereign good which is consequently good *fcr se;* and this is God. St. Anselm's taste for moral

[1] "As he is called by Henry of Huntingdon". *Hist. ¿big,,* vn, 27.
[2] J. de Ghellinck, *0/>. cit.,* p. 58-68. — [3] See vol. I, p. 672-673.

subjects must have led him to prefer this way, which was so dear to Augustine.

The second, based on *being,* was more original (ch. 3). All realities have at least this in common; they possess being, existence; and this requires a cause, and in the last analysis, a single cause for the totality of beings. For if there arc several causes, either they may be reduced to one, or each exists *per se,* or they produce one another mutually; but the last hypothesis is absurd; even the closely linked terms of a relation (master and servant) are not inter-causal; if there are several causes existing *per se,* they must derive their being from this common property, and thus we are brought back to a single cause, that which exists *per se,* and which we call God.

Diverse natures are superior one to the other according to an easily observed *hierarchy of perfection,* i. e., stone, animal, tree (ch. 4). It cannot be conceived that the terms of this hierarchy are infinite; at the summit there must be a being more perfect than the others. There cannot be more than one, unless they are equal by their essence, and in that case they form a single nature; if, in addition to their essence, they possessed something in common, they would be inferior to this something, which would be no other than the perfect essence or nature, that is to say, God. Hence we must conclude that God exists.

God is therefore the Sovereign Good, the first Cause and the perfect Essence.

These arguments were used with some modifications by St. Thomas; the first and the third in his fourth way *(degrees of perfection)* and the second in his second way *(efficient causes).* Their value is indisputable. Altogether different is the famous *so-called* "argument of St. Anselm" with which they have occasionally been associated.

The argument " a priori " developed in the *Proslogion*[1] begins with the *idea of God provided by faith* and concludes to His real existence :

God is conceived as one than Whom no greater is conceivable. This implies His existence both in thought and in reality; for did He exist only in the mind it would be possible to conceive a greater, existing also in reality. This being, God, has therefore a real existence. " Yes, real in my mind, but not necessarily without ", was the clever and perspicacious reply of the monk Gaunilo of Marmoutiers who took up the cudgels on behalf of the fool who was unaffected by the argument[2] ;" the Fortunate Isles may well exist in my mind, they nevertheless remain a beautiful dream". Saint Anselm replies[3] that the idea of God is an

[1] See above, p. 399. — [2] *Liber pro insipiente, P. L.,* 158, 241-248

[3] *Liber Apologéticas contra Caunilonem respondentem pro insipiente, P. L. ibid.,* 247-260.

idea apart, unique, with which can be compared neither that of the Fortunate Isles nor any other idea;it alone implies the idea of the internal necessity of real existence. God alone is such that His non-existence is inconceivable. Therefore the greatest being that can be conceived must exist in reality. — " No " replies St. Thomas[1], " it does not follow that the thing is in reality, but simply that it exists in the concept of the mind ".

St. Thomas' criticism is now generally admitted[2]. The argument however, was for a long time the subject of passionate discussion and has been maintained with slight modifications by many illustrious thinkers. Duns Scotus saw in it the proof of the possibility of the perfect Being. Leibnitz and Descartes modified it to suit their ideas. The ontologists also introduced a new element, alien to Anselm's conception : the vision of the object in the idea, or rather the acquisition of ideas through the vision of God.

These revisions have radically modified the original concept and St. Anselm would probably fail to recognise it as it now stands. The original argument would undoubtedly seem to entail a passage from the ideal to the real, from the possible or even the necessary ideal to real existence. There is lacking for the justification of this transaction some factual datum, such for instance as the following : this idea which is found in the mind and which guides man towards his last end, can only be explained on condition that such a being exists (argument based on the natural desire of happiness); or again, this idea is such that should there exist no corresponding real object, nothing in the world is explicable (argument summarising all the ordinary proofs). A minor premiss of supernatural or mystical nature may even be introduced ; for instance, by saying that the existence of the being which is conceived as the greatest, is demonstrated by the supernatural effects that it alone could produce in the soul ; deep peace and the blinding light of wisdom. In reality it would seem that Anselm fell a victim to an error of perspective and thus attributed to the sole idea of God, what, in practice, really derives from the conditions in which this idea is found for the enlightened believer. In this case the argument certainly possesses a relative subjective value, but has no general dialectic worth[3].

2. The Divine attributes are treated at length in the *Monologion* and the *Proslogion.* The reader should note in particular in the first of these treatises the remarkable sixth chapter which shows how essence and existence in God blend[4] together in one sovereign unity, and chapters VIII

[1] *Sum. theol.,* I, q. II, a. I, ad 2.

[2] See J. BAINVEL, *Anselm (Arg. de S.),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 135059.

[3] See above, p. 400.

[4] As light is inseparable from its brilliance : " Quemadmodum enim sese habent ad invicem lux et lucere et lucens, sic sunt ad se invicem essentia, esse et ens ". *Col.* 155.

and IX containing the principles of exemplarism : the universe created *ex nihilo* and in time, existed, before it was exteriorised in time, in the mind of God as form, image, and model, i. e., the exemplar1;*it was made in time only as an effect of His word or that of the Word. And Anselm continues thus to develop in a personal manner St. Augustine's theodicy, though he adds little that is new.

3. He dealt with the Trinity first in the *Monologion* where he explains the doctrine by comparisons with the human soul, the image *of* God and later and more fully in two special treatises 3. He has been reproached with exaggeration, at least verbal, for having thought it possible to give the "rationes necessariae" of the mystery4. We cannot be sure that he merely envisaged a high degree of probability5 6 In any case it would be unjust to suspect him of *rationalism,* for the great doctor in no wise claims that reason alone can discover and prove this great mystery. As we have already said, he begins with the hypothesis of a faith enlightened by the gifts of the Holy Ghost4. Even should he have been guilty of some exaggeration in these conditions, it is still a far cry to rationalism. He was well aware that this mystery is beyond the powers of the human mind7 and when he says, as he sometimes does, that it can be understood, we should accord these statements but a relative value, not forgetting that he himself reproached Roscelin and the dialecticians with bringing this mystery within the scope of reason.

4. St. Anselm's teaching on the Redemption is even more remarkable. It is contained almost entirely in the *Cur Deus homo**. He steadfastly refused to regard this mystery as a victory over the devil justified by the fact that the latter misused his power to cause the death of the innocent Christ. To Anselm's mind the devil has not even relative rights over mankind : his supposed rights are a concession made by God which He can withdraw at will 9. The Archbishop of Canterbury thus struck a mortal blow at an old and widely held opinion. He was perspicacious enough to perceive and use to good purpose the *essential elements* that are contained in the traditional doctrine of the Redemption. He showed that the Redemption is funda*

1 " Quasi exemplum, sive, ut aptius dicitur, forma, vel similitudo, aut regula ". *Coi.* 157· I

* *Monol.,* ch. 46 sq. — 3 See above, p. 400 sq.

4 See Tη. Heitz, *of>. cit.,* p. 60-64.

5 As d'Aguire, Van Weddingen and De Wulf suppose.

6 See above, p. 401.

* See *Monol.,* 64 · Videtur... transcendere omnem intellectus aciem animi. See however a number of other texts in J. Rivière, *0/>. cit.,* p. 303-307. f. Rivière, *of>. cit.,* p. 450-453.

mentally " reparation for sin conceived as an offence against God"; he analysed thoroughly "the gravity of this sin and the demands of Divine justice; and though the principles he invokes may not prove the necessity of the Incarnation and the Redemption they at least establish their sovereign congruity " L He has, indeed, been charged with some exaggeration in his demonstration : he appears to perceive in God " a twofold necessity : necessity of redeeming us, and, in order to redeem us, the necessity of exacting an adequate satisfaction which only a Man-God can provide " 2. It is possible to understand this necessity as meaning some thing eminently becoming to God, but such a liberal interpretation corresponds but ill to the work as a whole. It is setter to admit frankly that some of Anselm's expressions and even some of his ideas needed modification. This was done by later doctors 3, without in any way detracting from Anselm's immense services to theology.

5. His teaching on the Immaculate Conception of Mary is not altogether clear4. He undoubtedly penned these admirable words: " It was fitting that the greatest conceivable purity outside that of Cod, should shine forth in the Virgin to whom God the Father was to entrust His only begotten Son, born of His heart, equal to Himself, loved like Himself, and Who was to be the one and the same Son of God the Father and son of the Virgin"5. Of itself this phrase implies the Immaculate Conception. That such was Anselm's intention is less sure. He seems to insinuate the contrary when some lines further on 6 he writes that Mary was purified *(mundata est)* by her faith before her conception. But Anselm fails to make clear whether this purification, which must have taken place before birth, consisted in exemption from original sin and concupiscence, or from original sin in the strictest sense, or merely in consequent purification. Anselm at least clearly set out all the elements of the problem in a sense favourable to the Immaculate Conception and thus helped to prepare the final solution.

6. St. Anselm's spiritual teaching is characterised by its doctrinal quality. His piety was so deep and sincere and brought him such renown that many fine works on spiritual perfection were ascribed to him. In reality

1 *Ibid.*, p. 316. — 2 *Ibid.*, p. 314.
3 *Ibid.*, p. 315-316. J. Bainvel, *op. cit.*. col. 1316.
4 Sec X. le Bachelet, *ItnmacuUe Conception,* in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 995-1001.
5 Decens erat ut ea puritate qua major sub Deo nequit intelligi Virgo ilia niteret cui Deus Pater unicum Filium suum, quem de corde suo æqualem sibi genitum, tamquam seipsum diligebat, ita dare disponebat ut naturaliter esset unus idemque communis Dei Patris et Virginis Filius. *De Cone. Virg.*, c. 18.
6 Virgo eadem per fidem ante ipsam conceptionem mundata est. *Ibid.*, ï8. Cf. *Cur Dens homo,* 11, 16-17.

his authentic works on these subjects are not very numerous, but they find their necessary complement in his theological writings. St. Anselm was a master in the art of prayer, meditation or *orison.* He gives a number of written models, preceded by wise advice : " They should not be read feverishly *(non in tumultu)* but peacefully; not hastily, but little by little as a prolonged meditation ", for their purpose is to excite " the love or fear of God, or a careful examination of oneself". Nor is it necessary to read all, but only as much as is needful to kindle by prayer the flame of the love of God.

Anselm's piety moreover did not exclude the highest and noblest considerations. He had a most tender devotion for Christ and loved especially to meditate on his Divine nature. Some of his profoundest treatises on God, for instance the *Proslogion,* are thus not only studies but also long and fervent prayers. Right from the beginning the author seems to plunge himself with a fervent invocation into a supernatural atmosphere which continues to animate the whole work; and in the last chapters, writing of eternal happiness and beseeching a foretaste of it in this world, the saint hints that he has already tasted of its joys. The entire work gives the impression of a beautiful contemplative meditation of most noble inspiration.

"My God and my Lord", cries the author as he brings his work to a close, " my hope and joy of my heart, tell my soul if this joy is that of which you tell through thy Son : *Ask and you shall receive that your joy my be full {John.,* XVI, 24). For I have found the fullness and more than the fullness of joy. It is full in my heart, in my mind, in my soul: and were the whole man full of this joy, it would still be overflowing, beyond all measure... Oh! Speak Lord to thy servant in the secret places of his heart, say if this is the joy into which thy servants shall enter... I pray thee, My God that I may know thee, that I may love thee so as to partake in thy joy. And if I cannot obtain it in full in this life, let me advance every day towards its fullness : let my love increase here below that it may be full in heaven ; that my joy may be great through hope in this world and full (one day) on high in all reality" [1].

More ardent, perhaps are some pages of St. Augustine; but these from the *Proslogion* truly belong to his school. Few of his disciples have so closely imitated the master. Together with St. Bonaventure, it is Anselm's glory to have been in both theology and spiritual doctrine the greatest representative of mediaeval Augustinism.

[1] *Proslog.,* c. 26.

CHAPTER III.

Abelard.

Special Bibliography :

Editions: *P. L.,* 178, (1853). Victor Cousin, *Ouvrages inédits (l'Abélard,* 1836; *P. Abclardi opera* (new complete edit.), 2 vols, 1849-1859. R. Stolzle, *De unitate...* 1891. B. Geyer, *P. Abael. Schriften,* I, 1919. Studies: Ch. DE RÉMUSAT, *Abélard, sa vie, sa philosophie, sa théologie,* 2 vols, Paris, 1855. Vacandard, *Abélard, sa doctrine, sa méthode,* Paris, 1881 ; in the *Vie de S. Bernard,* vol. il, p. 118-176. E. Kayser, *Abélard, critique,* Freiburg, 1901. E. PORTALIÉ, *Abélard,* in *Diet, théol.* col. 36-55. J. DE Ghellinck, *le niouv. théol.* au XIIe s., p. 126-150. T. HEITZ, *Les rapports entre la phil. et la foi,* p. 7-30. G. ROBERT, *Les Ecoles et renseignement de la théologie pendant la première moitié du XIB s.,* Paris, 1904, p. 149-178. J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption,* Paris, p. 324-330, 460 sq. M. GrabmanN, *Geschichte der scholastischcn Methode,* π, (1911), p. 168-229.

L THE INTELLECTUAL ENVIRONMENT IN THE XIITH CENTURY.

Two outstanding figures attract the attention of the student of Christian thought in the Xllth century. They are Saint Bernard and Abelard. These two men, so much at variance, embody in themselves in different decrees two intellectual movements common at the time; two movements that ran parallel but never completely converged and which ended in violent opposition. Abelard, apart from his private life, was the perfect model and type of the schoolman. Some consideration of the interests that obsessed the "intellectuals" at this period will help us to understand the place he occupied.

In a century which, not without grounds, has been compared with the Renascence on account of its love for classical antiquity, \ the ancient Greek philosophies enjoyed an ever increasing popularity. *Plato,* vouched for by St Augustine, benefited by the unrivalled authority of this great doctor, then the acknowledged master in all schools,

l E. Gilson, *Etudes de Philosophie medievale,* Strasburg, 1921, ch. 1. *La phil. au M. A.,* I, p. 91*95·

and especially at Chartres. But curious minds were already dabbling in Aristotle or at least his greater theses, such, for instance, as his theory of knowledge. But the turn of the wheel that was to bring him into favour was still a century distant.

At the beginning of the xuth century the intellectual movement was most vigorous in the schools of France, and that of Chartres was the most famous *. The prevailing cult of Platonism is seen in the clear-cut *realism* of the majority of the masters on the cjuestion of the universals. The best known of these were three Chancellors of the School: Bernard of Chartres (d. before 1130), Gilbert de la Porree (d. 1154) who succeeded him as head of the School, until the year 1141 when he went to Paris, obtaining the see of Poitiers in the following year; Thierry OF Chartres, chancellor after Gilbert (1141) until his death (1155). The Englishman John of Salisbury! (d. 1180) was educated at Chartres and became bishop of that place in his latter years (in 1176). This fine scholar and humanist, who so skilfully defended study and learning against " Cornificius " and his like, was also a thorough-going philosopher, tempering the teaching of Plato with that Aristotle. Much less prudent was \\ ILLIAM OF CONCHES (1080-! 145) also an alumnus of Chartres, whose exaggerated realism led him to identify the Holy Gost with the *anima mundi,* though he never abandoned his faith: "Christianus sum, non académicos 'These *pantheist leanings* gradually crystallised themselves into a complete system, finally elaborated by BERNARD OF TOURS3 a friend of Thierry of Chartres, in a treatise *De tiiundi universitate qx Megacosmos et microcosmos*|, written between 1145 and 1153· I he monist and emanationist doctrines of the work were probably due to the influence of the " De divisione Naturae " of John Scotus Eriugena. In the xmth century, this pantheism found fresh adherents not belonging to the school of Chartres, though they were probably in touch with its teaching.

Gilbert de la Porrée 5, mentioned above, is especially remembered on account of his unfortunate adaptation of his metaphysical theories to theology. His philosophy was so vague that some historians have been able to regard him as teaching an excessive realism, while others find nothing exaggerated in his theories. In any case he certainly made

| A. Clerval, *Les écoles de Chartres au moyen âge du Ve au Xi'l's.,* Paris, 1S95. M. de ULF, *op. at.,* p. 139 sq. E. Giijson, *Le platonisme di Bernard de Chartres,* in *Revue néo·scoi.,* 1923. p. 5-19.

' M. DE WuLF, *op. cit.*. p. 166-177. See below, p. 464.

3 *Ibid.,* p. 180 sq. See below, p. 480. H

4 Edit. Baroch and Wrobel, in *Bibl. philos, media a:tatis* 1876

' F. Veknbt, *Gilbert tir la P-.^Dict. thial.,* col. 1350-1358. Gilbert's chief works are his commentaries of Boethius' works *(P.* £ Aχ! the famous opusculum *Dr rrx principii,* (Λ !... ,88. 1257-1270) and a number of biblical commentaries. uiuuwi

too much of the real distinction between the common essence and the essence as it exists in the individual, and this, when applied to theology, had serious consequences, The Council of Reims (i 148) at the instigation of St Bernard, condemned four propositions that were ascribed to him. Rather than incur a formal condemnation he withdrew them immediately. He was accused of establishing a real difference between God, *Deus,* on the one hand and the divine essence and attributes, *divinitas,* on the other, (1st proposition), and again, between the divine essence and the Divine Persons (2nd proposition); thirdly, of affirming that the three Persons alone are eternal, but not their properties, relations, etc. (3rd proposition), lastly, that the Divine Nature was not made flesh (4th proposition). To the last, which possessed a Nestorian tendency, the Council opposed the following proposition : " Credimus *ipsam divinitatem,* sive substantiam divinam sive naturam dicas, *incarnatam* esse, sed in Filio " l.

There were many famous schools · in the Xllth century, though none so renowned as Chartres. While the influence of the *monastic* schools was beginning to wane}, the *episcopal* schools, on the contrary led the intellectual revival that was stirring in the West. But these schools, it has been said, were "built of men"4 5and seemed to draw all their prestige from the teaching of a particularly brilliant master: when he disappeared, they declined. *Anselm of Laon** (d. 1117) thus made the reputation of the school of that name, while that of Reims. suffering an eclipse after Gerbert, flourished again with *Alberic* in the Xllth century, and that of TOURS, compromised by Berengarius regained its popularity with *Bernard Silvestris.* Few, however, enjoyed the long glory of Chartres. But in the first years of the Xllth century Chai tres itself was challenged by Paris, a redoubtable rival, which ended by drawing to its doors the youth of all the countries

' See F. Vernet, in *Did. théol.,* col. 1353.

3 See G. Robert, *Les Ecoles et Renseignement de la théologie pendant la première moitié du XIIe s.,* Paris, 1909.

3 See *ibid.,* p. 15-20.

4 An expression borrowed by G. Robert from II. Pasquier, who applied il to the guilds.

5 Anselm of Laon was the author of the first known summa theologica in the Middle Ages, the *Sententia,* published by G. Lefèvre (Evreux 1895) and in *Beitrlipe* (by Blieinetzrieder, vol. XVIII, 1919). The latter also attributes to him the *Sententia· divina: pagina.* Anselm treats of God in Himself, the Trinity, the Creation and the Redemption. He drew his inspiration from St. Augustine and St. Anselm, and also from Eriugena, whose Monism he left aside. Philosophy is given a large place in his writings. M. de Wulf considers he had a real influence in preparing the ground for the schools of Abelard and of Hugh of St. Victor, while Ghcllinck minimises it. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* I, p. 188-189. P. Fournier, *Anselme de Laon,* in *Diet. Hist.,* col. 485-487.

of Europe who were then pouring into France. In Paris at this time were two famous schools; *Notre Dame* in the He de France and that of *Ste Geneviève* at the gates of the town. Students were mainly attracted to these schools by the celebrated William of Champeaux, and a little later, by Abelard.

William of Champeaux * (1070-1122) filled one of the chairs at the Cathedral school of Paris, about 1100, with such brilliance, that students came to his lectures in crowds. Though he had been a disciple of Roscelin at Compïègne, he held the doctrine of the absolute reality of universals, a teaching that was enthusuastically acclaimed until the day when Abelard, still a student, dared to withstand the master. Shattered by the criticism of his young rival, he withdrew in 1108 to St. Victor where he opened a new school and continued teaching in the face of opposition, until his nomination in 1113 to the See of Chalons put an end to these heroic controversies. At the outset, William claimed that the universal common essence (of substance) is one and the same in every subordinate substance; each contains it in the measure of its whole reality; the individual is no more than an accidental modification of the specific substance; the essence an accident of the " generic essence"[1]3 It follows from that this, that every man is the entire human species; that this doctrine is already to be found entirely in Plato and Socrates. Abelard found it but child's play to throw ridicule on this doctrine. We cannot be certain that it was ever abandoned by William as Abelard asserted. He nevertheless refrained from any rash attempts at applying it to theology λ He made a worthy bishop at Chalons and was honoured by St. Bernard's friendship.

II. PETER ABELARD (1079-1142).

Peter Abelard was born at Pallet near Nantes. His first master in philosophy was the nominalist Roscelin. About 1100 he came to Paris in order to attend the lectures of the

1 E. Michaud, *Guillaume de Champeaux,* Paris, 1867. G. Lefèvre, *Les variations de G. de Ch.,* Lille, 1891. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 136-168. Th. Heitz, *op. cit.,* p. 65-67 M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. m¿d.,* 1, p. 139-141.

2 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 140.

3 Only fragments of bis work are extant; on the origin of the soul, on the Eucharist (P. *L.,* 163, 1039, sq.. 1045 sq.) and some others, edited by G. Patru, V. Cousin. On his caution in applying philosophy to dogma, see Heitz, *op. cit.,* p. 66.

leader of the realists, William of Champeaux. Before long, he set himself up as a decided adversary of these two masters. At Melun (1102), then at Corbeil, and finally at Sainte Genevieve he attracted hundreds of admirers, with no other qualification than his own genius. Having gone into Picardy to study theology at the feet of the famous Anselm of Laon, he was not long in rebelling against his new master. He remained in this town until he became head of the school of Notre Dame at Paris (1113). Henceforth he enjoyed a worldwide renown. But his private life fell far short of his learning. His seduction of Heloise put an end for several years to his teaching in the capital (1118).

After his flight to Brittany and separation from Heloise who became a nun at Argenteuil, Abelard, mutilated and humiliated, returned to the Abbey of Saint-Denis. Here he again began to teach, mainly against *Roscelin* whose nominalism and Tritheism especially, he endeavoured to refute in his *De unitate et Trinitate* L On the question of universals Abelard clearly differed from Roscelin: but if his conceptualism was at bottom no more than a disguised nominalism, he shewed himself incapable of using it to the best advantage. In treating of the Trinity, instead of insisting on the person, he so dealt with the nature that he left no more than a verbal and modal distinction between the persons[2]. Condemned at the Council of Soissons (1121) he yielded to force while not abandoning his ideas, which he soon explained in his *Theologia Christiana* [3], a simple revision of the proscribed work. Shortly after, having been expelled from St. Denis for having denied the Areopagitic origins foundation of the Abbey he withdrew to the solitude of the *Paraclete* (near Nogent-sur-Seine) where he was followed by thousands of disciples. From 1125 to 1129 he was Abbot of St. Gildas de Rhuys[4] but returned to the Paraclete in 1129 where he brought Heloise as Abbess of the Oratory of the Paraclete. In 1136 he is again found at Paris, giving brilliant lectures at Sainte-Geneviève.

[1] Discovered and edited by R. Stolze, 1S91.

[3] Sabellian tendency. See vol. I, p. 173-176.

[3] *P. L.*, 178, 1123-1330.

[4] .At this time he wrote his *Historia calamitatum* (Ep. 1), an autobiography ; it shows few signs of repentance.

It was here that the serious and well founded charges against his orthodoxy were to be made.

Abelard's work treats mainly of theological matters. On pure PHILOSOPHY, in addition to the *Dialectical* he wrote little more than a commentary on Porphyry *(Glossulaf* and a moral treatise *(Scilo teipsum)* [3], which is philosophical rather than religious in tone. The remainder[4] of his work touches the faith, even the "*Dialogue* between a philosopher, a Jew and a Christian s" an apologetical writing revealing evident rationalist tendencies. His *sermons*[5] are somewhat frigid compositions written for the nuns of the Paraclete. In addition to notes on the Hexaemeron he wrote an important *commentary* in 5 books on the Epistle to the Romans[7]. But his strictly THEOLOGICAL TREATISES are more widely known : first the two above mentioned refutations of Roscelin[8][9] of a vast "Summa" of theology, entitled *Introductio ad theologiam*[**], there remains only the first part on the faith and the Trinity (in 3 books): the work as a whole was to contain a study of a) faith (and the mysteries); b) the Sacraments (and the Incarnation); c) charity (and all moral theology). There is extant a valuable summary, *Epitome theologice Christiana*[10],* probably the work of one of his disciples. Of greater importance, since it exercised a greater influence, was the *Sic et Non* ", mentioned below.

The delicate and penetrating eye of St. Bernard detected in these writings many propositions that outraged him. His attention was drawn to the errors of maître Peter a little before 1140 [12]. He first saw him privately and elicited a promise of retractation, or at least of prudence. Soon, however, Abelard himself challenged the Abbot of Clairvaux to a public debate in the Council of Sens (1140). After some hesitation[1] Bernard agreed, but came as an accuser, asking the assembly to condemn the points of the erroneous teaching of the Breton master which he had summarised in 18 propositions. Abelard, taken aback at this turn of events, refused to justify himself and appealed to Rome. The Council therefore sent the propositions to

1 Edit. Cousin.
2 Edit. Geyer.
3 Or *Ethica : P. L.* 178, 1759-1824.
4 Except of course his letters f*P. L.,* 178, 113*380). Poems and hymns are also extant. *Ibid.,* 1759-1824.
5 *L., ibid.,* 1611-1684.
6 I here are 34: *P. L., ibid.,* 379-610. Add two explanations of the Creed.
7 *P. I.., ibid.,* 731-784 (Hexaem.), 783-978 (Rom.).
8 *De Unitate et Trinitate; Theologia Christiana.*
9 *P. L., ibid.,* 979-1114.
10 *P. L., ibid.,* 1685-1758.
11 *E E., ibid.,* 1339-1610.
12 See \ ACANDArd, *Hist, de St Bernata,* ch. xxn and XXin E. Portalie, *op. cit.,* coi. 43-48.

Rome, desiring Innocent II to condemn the accused himself. Bernard again acted as spokesman for the council in a letter (Ep. 197) that constitutes a veritable indictment. He won his cause. The *Capitula hæresum P. Abaelardi* denounced in the letter were nearly all (12 out of 18) condemned as heretical. These errors mainly concerned the Trinity (modalism), creation (exaggerated optimism;, Christ (Nestorian leanings), redemption (transformed in practice into a simple lesson in charity), grace (latent Pelagianism), even morality (neglect of the objective element and too much insistence on the subjective element). Particularly grave was his error on the Redemption which did away with all objective value in the Passion of Christ[x].

Abelard was on his way to Rome to plead his cause when he was surprised at Lyons (1141) by the news that the pope had confirmed the verdict of the Council of Sens (1140). He therefore turned his steps towards Cluny, where Peter the Venerable welcomed him with real kindness and persuaded him to sign a *profession offaith,* "which, in spite of a trace of bitterness, is sincerely Catholic[2]". Peter was also successful in reconciling him with St. Bernard. He remained for some months at Cluny giving every sign of repentance. He died shortly afterwards, truly sorry for his errors and firmly devoted to the Church.

Abelard's pious end, coming swiftly after his retractation and ex dicit declarations concerning the limits of our knowlec ge of the divine [3] clearly proves that his was not the rationalism of the free-thinkers. Of itself, the principle

[x] See J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 324-330. Abelard rightly criticises the theory of the rights of the devil (460-461), though not without exaggeration, (p. 470-471). In his Christology, though Abelard was not Nestorian, he tended thereto by his rejection of the communication of characters, and by what has been termed his Christological nihilism, as it is summarily expressed in this expression: *Christus, secundum quod homo, non est aliquid,* not a substantial reality, i. c., the substantial reality of the Incarnate Word. In order to rule out this last identity, the union of the two natures was attenuated to the extent of making it no more than accidental. This formulary was adopted by some of Abelard's disciples, even Peter Lombard. See below, p. 460, Cf. *Did. thiol.,* art. *Adoptianisme,* col. 413-417.
2 E. PortaliÉ, *op. cit.,* col. 38.
3 See Kayser, *op. cit.,* p. 91 sq. T. Heitz, *op. cit.* p. 13-20. *Comprehendere,* is proper to God ; *cognoscere,* to the Blessed in heaven ; *intelligere,* to the scholar in this world. See especially M. GrabmaNN, *op. cit.,* p. 177-199.

that reason can aid in the investigation of dogma is excellent; but Abelard, led away by his natural impetuosity, misused it, notably when treating of the Trinity [1]. His error was due to imprudence and rashness, not to incredulity. His ill-ordered life undoubtedly indicates that his faith did not always rule his conduct, any more than his speculation; but his very real weaknesses were no proof that he had quite lost the faith. Nor was the *Sic and Non,* as has been said, wholly intended to discredit the Fathers. The project, of course, was bold enough: the gathering together, on 150 important theological questions, of contradictory Patristic evidence on each subject was not without its dangers. But as Abelard himself explains, he desired to set out these problems in all their difficulty, the better to discover a solution, and he provided principles that were calculated to achieve this end [2].

Abelard's wide influence in intellectual circles of the XIIth century is unconlested. Some indeed consider him to be the founder of scholasticism, but this honour is undoubtedly due to St Anselm. The methods of the saintly archbishop were less spectacular; his influence was felt more slowly, but it nevertheless became gradually more widespread. Abelard may certainly be credited with the creation or at least the inspiration of a theological school of thought that cautiously adopted his method. He was not the first to conceive the idea of compressing all theology in a true *Summa*[3]; Anselm of Laon had already composed such a work [4]. But though he was not the pioneer, Abelard was the first to carry out this scheme in such a way as to inspire others to do the same. It has recently been pointed out that four *Summer* dating from the first half of the xiilh century undoubtedly derive from him[5]. His method created both a theological and a canonical school[6]. Though it cannot be said that the *Sic et Non* properly gave rise to scholasticism by introducing the *disputation* into the schools, it paved the way for this innovation, induced the professors to be more rigorous in their presentation of Patristic texts and led to a greater use of dialectics. Such valuable results have brought him fame. His own imprudence would have seriously compromised his

1 See Heitz, *ibid.,* p. 20-30.

a See G. Robert, *op. cit.,* p. 167-16S.

3 In the *Introductio ad theologiam.*

4 See above p. 415.

5 Dependence demonstrated by Er. Denifle in his studies on Abelard in *Archiv. fur Literatur,* 1885, vol. I. The works in question are the *Epitome* attributed to Abelard himself (see above), the *Sententia* of Roland Bandinelli (the future Alexander III), edited by Fr. Gietl, 1S91; a Summa by *Ognibene,* probably the canonist, and another by an anonymous writer *(Bibl.* Saint Florian, Austria). I

' G. Robert, *op. cit.,* p. 170-178; M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 217-222. This latter author stresses Aristotle's influence parallel with that of Abelard.

method had not wise imitators, such as the disciples of the School of St. Victor maintained its value in the eyes of prudent theologians*

Abelard's chief claim to fame in philosophy consists in his having assimilated Aristotle's theory of knowledge more thoroughly than any of his contemporaries. Therein he found the weapons to combat efficaciously both William of Champeaux' absolute realism and Roscelin's nominalism. But his own *via media,* usually termed *conceptualism,* was so vague that it is still doubtful what he really thought.

M. de Wulf takes it in the sense of the moderate realism [2] which gradually permeated the schools, and considers that the theories of the two intellects which were developed in the XIIIth century were no more than "a logical outcome of his teaching". But it is very doubtful whether all this was clearly foreseen by Abelard or that he possessed the genius to construct a system. He was above all an incomparable teacher. His influence was felt in all the schools of the XIIth century, and in spite of its defects it had a wholesome and favourable effect on philosophy.

CHAPTER IV»

Saint Bernard.

Special Bibliography :

Editions: *P. L.,* 182-185 (Mabillon's ed., 1667; Massuet, 1690, and LeTexier, 1719). Eng. tr., Eales and Hodges, London 1889.

Studies: E. Vacandard, *Vie de S. Bernard,* Paris, 1895 (2 vols) art. *Bernard (saint)* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 746-785; 5. *Bernard, orateur,* Paris, 1887 ; *Abélard, sa lutte avec S. Bernard,* Paris, 1881. G. Goyau, 5. *Bernard,* Paris, 1928. G. Salvayre, 5. *Bernard, maître de la vie spirituelle,* Avignon, 1909. A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu...,* Paris, 1921 (3rd ed.) p. 133-154 P. POURRAT, *La spiritualité chrét.,* il (1921), Paris, p. 34-118. See also M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der scholastischcn methode,* II, p. 94-108. T. HEITZ, *Les rapports entre la philosophie et la foi...,* p. 67-70. J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption,* p. 333-339 and 465-471. X. Le Bachelet, *Immaculée Conception,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1010-1015. J. Rivière, *Mérite,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 671-675.

* To Abelard 's credit it may be added that he defended the privilege of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady. X. le Bachelet, *Imm. Cone.,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1015-1019. The stumbling block for Bernard; — the sinful nature of concupiscence in the marriage act — had no meaning for Abelard who considered that this act could be absolutely good. — a M. DE WULF, *op. cit.,* I, p. 151-156.

I. LIFE OF SAINT BERNARD. HIS PLACE IN HISTORY.

As opposed to Abelard, the schoolman devoured with a passion for knowledge, Saint Bernard stands out as a moderating influence. With rare cogency he pointed out the dangers of rash speculation and visited his reproof even on the foremost masters in the schools. But his influence in contemporary affairs did not stop at this. lie was active and successful in every sphere. He brought about the reform of the monks and the highest ranks of the clergy; he undertook the defence of the Church in the person of the pope, and championed Christendom against Islam. In the *doctrinal* field his preferences were for mysticism; a mysticism which, far from confining him to the backwaters of the great intellectual stream that characterises the Xllth century, enabled him when the time was ripe, to play a leading part and prove a greater and more powerful guide than the professional exponents of learning.

Born at Fontaines near Dijon in 1090, to Tescelin, an officer of the Duke of Burgundy, and Aleth of Montbard, Bernard was given a thorough Christian and secular education. As a youth he gave proofs of deep piety and at the age of twenty-two entered the monastery of Citeaux.

The story of his vocation is touching. When he was twenty years of age he began to find a certain pleasure in mixing with worldlings'. Two violent temptations opened his eyes to the dangers of this course and he overcame them heroically by plunging himself into a frozen pond. He resolved to live henceforth a celibate life, and to strengthen his determination he decided to leave the world. He prevailed on his uncle Gaudry, four of his brothers and twenty five young friends to accompany him. After making a trial of the solitary life for six months at Chatillon they all entered the Abbey of CITEAUX (spring of 1112). Later, his father and his youngest brother, Ñivard, came to join him at Clairvaux.

Bernard remained at *Citeaux*[1] for only three years (1112-II15); years of training and progress in the spiritual life (spurred on by the cry of " Bernarde, ad quid venisti?)"; years of silence, recollection and prayer. By the year 1115 he was judged capable of ruling in his turn. The abbot, Stephen Harding, entrusted him with the task of founding

1 E. Vacandard, *Vie,* p. 1S sq.
8 *ibid.,* p. 34 sq.

Clairvaux [1] in order to relieve Citeaux, where postulants had been arriving in ever increasing numbers during the previous three years. Clairvaux experienced the same rapid growth and founded three new monasteries in succession. From that time until St. Bernard's death, the Cistercian Order spread rapidly, and in 1153 numbered 350 abbeys, of which 160 had been founded by Clairvaux and its dependents, as opposed to only 190 founded by the four mother abbeys. Some of these foundations sheltered hundreds of monks; 700, for instance, at Clairvaux. The originator of this movement was Bernard.

At the same time he made his influence felt in the other Orders. The monks of Cluny were the first. They had already suffered from the lesson in austerity that the Cistercians were giving them, both indirectly and sometimes even too bluntly. A certain amount of controversy took place. Bernard defended the reform[2] in an severe *Apologia* [3] blaming the older Benedictines for various relaxations in their mode of dress and food, condemning luxury and even going as far as to proscribe the use of works of art in the holy places. This criticism resulted in a notable progress in the great work of reform inaugurated by the great abbot of Cluny, Peter the Venerable, who, nevertheless retained a wider conception of the religious life in general and openly favoured the cultivation of the arts[4]. These two tendencies, which, as Vacandard remarks, is a question of temperament rather than clearly defined principle, continued to exist after the controversy and still remain today. The two abbots were immediately reconciled, for each in his way had the same end in view. But Bernard's intervention had stopped the rot in Cluny[5], and many were the abbots who owed to him their return to a more religious manner of life; among these may be mentioned the great *Suger*[6], Abbot of Saint-Denis.

Bernard also laboured for the reform of the secular clergy, even those of the highest rank: his letter to the Archbishop of Sens is a veritable treatise on ecclesiastical discipline[7]. Nor did layfolk escape his net: he preached justice and charity to all, and resignation to the serfs. He encouraged the Knights Templar[8] whose example did so much to accentuate the Christian spirit of chivalry. And when occasion required he recalled to their duty the kings of France

1 *Ibid.,* p. 61 sq.

9 A number of Cistercian monks had been imprudent enough to scoff at the, religious life of Cluny. The abbot, Peter the Venerable, turned on these critics in a passionate letter and even called them " Pharisees ". *Vie,* 1, p. 100-105.

3 See below', p. 428.

4 E. Vacandard, *Vie,* 1, p· 115-123.

5 *Ibid.,* p. 124 sq.

6 *Ibid.,* p. 174 sq. Suger's works are in *P. L.,* 186; chiefly composed of the *Life* of Louis VI, and a collection of 187 letters.

7 *De officio episcoporum.*

8 *De laude nova militia.*

Louis λ I and Louis VII the Younger, when they interfered in the government of the Church'.

Saint Bernard played a leading part during the schism of Anacletus II (1130-1138) which began with the election of Pope Innocent II (1130-1143/ "Bernard, after having examined, at the Council of Etampes (1130) the respective claims of Innocent and Anacletus to the tiara, judged that neither of these two elections that so divided Roman opinion, was free of irregularity; but, in order to avoid a greater evil, he overlooked the defects of form and spoke in favour of Innocent whose moral qualités seemed to him to offer a guarantee for the dignity and welfare of the Church. Louis VI accepted his decision and soon afterwards Henry I of England and King Lothair also adopted this view. But the followers of Anacletus, who were numerous in Rome, Milan, and southern Italy, were not inclined to yield. Thrice Bernard crossed the Alps (1133, 1135» 1137) and finally assured the triumph of Innocent. He remained in Rome from December 1137 to June 1138. Anacletus died about this time and the anti-pope Victor IV succeeded him. But the Abbot of Clairvaux gradually weaned all the Romans from their adherence to this new anti-pope. Victor realised how indefensible was his position and submitted to Innocent II. The schism was ended"[1][2].

Having vanquished schism, St. Bernard entered the lists against heresy. On his return to France his attention was drawn to the wildness of *Abelard's* theological teaching. He realised its perils, instituted proceedings against the reformer and had him condemned, first at the Council of Sens (1140) and then at Rome by Innocent II[3]. Some years later he obtained a retractation from another famous professor, *Gilbert de la Porree,* Bishop of Poitiers[4], at the Council of Reims (1148). A graver menace to the faith was the *Manichaean* teaching which was rampant on the Rhine borders and in Languedoc. In 1145 Bernard paid an apostolic visit to the latter province and succeeded in checking the evil without, however, entirely uprooting it[5].

1 E. Vacandard, *Vie,* i, 265 sq.; II, 177 sq.
2 E. Vacandard, in *Did. (h¿oL·,* col. 747.
3 See above, p. 41S.
4 See above, p. 415.
5 E. Vacandard, *Vie,* π, p. 217 sq.

In the following year Bernard accepted from Eugene III the task of preaching the second crusade which had just been launched by Louis VII'. His preaching at Vezelay (1146) met with white hot enthusiasm. He wrote copious letters, seeking volunteers for the great Christian cause; he visited the Rhine marches and finally prevailed on the king, Conrad 111, to join the crusade (Spires, Dec. 1146-Jan. 1147 . The expedition unfortunately failed, due to a lack of organisation and co-operation between the two armies of Louis and Conrad. Bernard was blamed for the fiasco. Though blameless, he defended himself, but suffered a great deal from this unwarranted attack. He did not lose heart however, but planned another attempt, with Suger; but this was never made.

The welfare of the universal Church was his chief care until the end of his life, especially since the See of Peter was then occupied by one of his disciples. The future pope, *Eugene III* (1145-1153) was first a canon of the cathedral of Pisa before becoming a monk at Clairvaux. Bernard had him made Cistercian abbot of Three Fountains near Rome and he was elected pope just at the time that the Romans in revolt proclaimed a *Republic* that was to endure ten years.

Eugene III was able to spend no more than a month at Rome at the end of 1145, and Slx months at the end of 1149. The prime mover in the rebellion was *Arnold of Brescia** whose doubtful antecedents Eugene had been rash enough to overlook and whom he allow to return to the eternal city. Priest and religious, a follower of Abelard at Sens (1140), Arnold claimed to reform the Church, reducing it to the purely spiritual order and subjecting it in all things to the princes; he taught further that the true Church no longer existed. Eugene excommunicated him in 1148, but was never able to restore his own authority in full. This was accomplished by his successor, Adrian IV in 1155.

While Eugene III was bearing the brunt of the insurrection Bernard for his part was meditating on the reform *of* the Church, but in a very different spirit from Arnold. The *De Consideratione* written between 1149 and 1153 contains an exhaustive project for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, particularly as regards the Roman Curia. Bernard scathingly denounced many abuses, without weakening the foundations of the Church : the popes who condemned Arnold, made his schemes their own. This treatise was the testament Bernard bequeathed to Eugene, or rather to his successors, for Eugene III died in July 1153. He was followed to the grave by Bernard,

' *Ibid.,* p. 259 sq., 415 scl·
'E. Vacandard, *Vie,* n, p. 235 sq.

(August 1153). He was canonised in 1174 and proclaimed Doctor of the Church in 1830. For long centuries before that he had already been known as the *Doctor mellifluus.*

II. WORKS.

The majority of Bernard's writings and also the most interesting from a doctrinal point of view are his *oratorical works.* Of great worth also are his 14 *treatises* or *opuscula,* especially the 5 devoted to spiritual teaching; 4 others deal with his reforms and 5 with diverse questions. His vast *correspondence* contains more than 500 letters.

A). Sermons.

There remain extant 332 of Bernard's sermons, classed under four heads.

a) 86 sermons de tempore: 1*mostly for Sundays and feastdays; 4 "De laudibus B. M. V., super missus est"3; 1 on the Holy Innocents; and 17 on Ps. 90: " Qui habitat" 3. The latter probably date from 1140; sermons 11-14 °f this latter group, particularly the twelfth, explain the traditional doctrine of the *guardian angels*4.

b) 43 sermons De aanctia:5 panegyrics of many saints, particularly of Our Lady whose principal mysteries are magnificently explained. Especially should be noted the sermon on the Nativity, entitled " De aquæductu " 6 which deals with the doctrine of the mediation of the Blessed Virgin. Various funeral orations, for his brother Gerard, for instance (serm. 26 *in Cant.),* may be classed together with these panegyrics.

c) 117 sermons de diversis7, shorter than the foregoing·.

d) 84 sermons on the Canticle of Canticles:8 the first were composed in 1135; the last six shortly before his death. They contain the whole of his mystical teaching.

Saint Bernard's oratorical work forms an admirable model of Christian and apostolic eloquence 9. The majority oí

1 *D. L.,* 183, 35-360.
3 *ibid,,* 55-88.
3 *Ibid.,* 185-254.

4 For many centuries devotion to the guardian angels has been fed by these eloquent pages, so deeply penetrated with tender piety. The spreading of this devotion thus owes much to St. Bernard. See a number of extracts in L. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 89-92. Homily xii is quoted in the Breviary for the 2nd October. St. Bernard also treats of the angels in many other sermons and treatises. Cf. VacanDARD, *Did. thiol.,* 769770.

5 *P. L., ibid.,* 359-536.
6 *Ibid.,* 437-44S·
' *Ibid.,* 537-748.
8 *Ibid.,* 785-1198.
See L. \kcaxdard, I *it,* 1, ch. XV1, Bernard orateur, p. 453-470.

these sermons were delivered in the chapter room for the choir monks. (Bernard gave special instructions in the vernacular to the lay brothers)[1]. All these works, at least as regards their style, were preached without preparation. Hence is explained the lack of classical division and the many digressions, as also that oratorical fire which, together with the nobility of thought, is the outstanding character of these discourses, and which places them, as Vacandard observes, " among the masterpieces of the French pulpit"[2]. The subject of these sermons was the fruit of long meditation by S. Bernard. " The bread must be baked before it is served to the listener", he used to say; and he was always afraid of being "a poor baker". His fear was unfounded. His discourses contain a solid doctrinal substance enveloped in a " clear, precise, and sometimes incisive " style. He has been criticised for his fondness for punning and his antitheses; but these were the defects of his time. " The excellence of the orator lies not so much in the purity of his style as in the nobility of his ideas and the fire of his zeal. In this respect St. Bernard had no rivals to fear "[3].

B) Treatises.

a) The most famous treatises of St. Bernard are concerned with the doctrine of perfection. As will be shown below, they may be grouped so as to form a very valuable ascetic *Sumina.* They are not, however, composed on a preconceived plan but were written in various circumstances.

1. The opusculum *De gradibus humilitatis ei superbia*[4] was written between 1121 and 1125 at the request of Godefroid, Abbot of Fontenay who wished for an explain lion of the chapter of the Benedictine Rule that deals with the twelve degrees of humility. St. Bernard sent him a written summary of the instructions he had just given to his religious on this subject (21 chapters).

2. The book De diligendo Deo [5] was also an opusculum written about 1126 at the request of his friend Aimery, chancellor of the Roman church.

[1] It is probable that these instructions were never written down. But many of the above mentioned sermons were translated into French at the end of the XHth century or at the beginning of the XUIth. These texts are extant and form the first examples of oratory in this tongue. See C. Des Granges, *Hist, litt.fr.;* 1910, p. 158.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 470.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] A 182, 941-972.

[5] *Ibid.,* 973-1000. Recent translation in the Collection *Pax.*

3. The treatise De gratia et libero arbitrio [1] was written about 1127 in answer to a question from one of his hearers: if merit comes from the grace of God, what part is played by freewill? His answer is founded on St. Augustine's leaching.

4. In the De præcepto et dispensatione [2], written to some monks who had consulted him [3], Bernard explains the doctrine of religious obedience and at the same time, of religious perfection in general.

5. The most important of all these writings is the De Consideratione [4], whose composition occupied many years and which was written for the pope Eugene III: 1st book, 1149; 2nd, 1150; 3rd, 1152; 4th-5th, 1153. It is a work on asceticism as well as pastoral theology.

b) In his treatises concerning the reform, Bernard denounces abuses in all classes of society.

1. The Apology [5], dedicated to William of Saint-Thierry, about 1127 was ostensibly a defence of his own order, but consisted in reality of a vigorous and clever indictment of the great Benedictine abbey of Cluny, then at the peak of its fame. Although this eloquent work did not have all the effect desired by Bernard, it at least proved a powerful auxiliary to Peter the Venerable in his efforts to increase the fervour of religious life at Cluny, and kept the monks to the narrow path that their founders had prescribed.

2. Bernard gives a lesson to the flower of the secular clergy in his De moribus et officio episcoporum [6], a letter to Henry, Archbishop of Sens, in which he encourages him in his resolve to live a life of perfection. Bernard counsels above all chastity, charity and humility. With quite apostolic bluntness he warns him against the perils of ambition, luxury and the spirit of independence, explicitly reminding him of the obligation of docile submission to the Sovereign Pontiff. Many bishops, after Henry, profited by this wise advice.

3. The writing De conversione ad clericos [7] is addressed to the clergy and the young men who frequented the schools. It consists of a sermon preached in Paris, revised and amended by the author, and has become a short treatise on conversion.

4. In the De laude novæ militiæ ad milites Templi [8] Bernard encourages the founder of the new Order of the Temple, that "new knighthood" so different from the worldly knighthood so pitilessly flayed by Bernard: to the warlike spirit *of* the latter the great abbot opposes a wholly Christian thesis on war which, in the course of time had a moderating effect on feudal customs. The end of the work consists of moral considerations on the Holy Places.

[1] *P. L.,* 182, 1001-1030.
[2] *Ibid.*, 859-894.
[3] They had written to him without the knowledge of their abbot. Bernard sent his answer to a friend (an abbot) and charged him to deliver it to these monks through the medium of their superior.
[4] *P. L.,* 182, 727-808. See above, p. 425 and below, p. 438.
[5] *P. L.,* 182, 895-915.
[6] *P. L.*. 182. 809-834.
[7] *Ibid.,* 833-856.
[8] *Ibid.*, 921-940.

c) Saint Bernard's other opuscula deal with diverse matters, theology, liturgy, hagiography.

1. The treatise De baptismo aliisque quæstionibus [7] is an answer to a series of questions or difficulties put to St. Bernard by his friend Hugh of Saint Victor on the subject of baptism, on our knowledge of the mystery of the Incarnation as derived from the Fathers of the Old Testament, and on angels. The difficulties dealt with in this work are probably the consequence of Abelard's criticisms of Bernard.

2. The Contra Capitula errorum Petri Abelardi[9] is the letter sent to the pope by Bernard, together with the *Capitula,* when he denounced Abelard. "This writing is rightly considered as being among the best of the author's works. It has, however, been criticised as not covering Abelard's teaching as a whole. It was nevertheless very much to the point, for Bernard denounced the abuse of the speculative method which was the characteristic and danger of Abelard's theology "[3].

3. The Dialogue on the Cistercian Antiphonal[4] or *Tractatus de cantu,* consists of a prefatory letter to a revised antiphonal.

4. An Office of St. Victor[5] composed by Bernard is extant: three hymns are worthy of notice; the poet deliberately neglects his quantities the better to render the sense. " His verses fall far short of his prose", says Vacandard.

5. The Life of St. Malachy[6], Archbishop of Armagh and a friend of St. Bernard, is a masterpiece of hagiography. " One of the most finished of the works of the Abbot of Clairvaux. Here, his style reaches a pitch of purity, clarity, elegance and originality, surpassed by none of his contemporaries, not even John of Salisbury"[7].

C) Letters. Attributed Works.

Saint Bernard's correspondence comprises 534 published letters [8] and it is probable that many others are preserved in manuscript. A few of these letters are to be found in the opuscula: Ep. 42, to Henry of Sens *(De moribus),* 77 to Hugh of St. Victor *(De baptismo),* 190 to Pope Innocent II *(Contra Abcelardum).* With this latter should be classed letters 188, 192, 193, 331-336, 338, since they also deal with the same subject.

[8] *Ibid.,* 1031-1046.

[9] *Ibid.,* 1053-1072. Text of the *Capitula,* in *P. L.,* 182, 1049-1053. See especially *Did. théol.,* art. *Abélard,* col. 43-45.

[3] E. Vacandard, *op. cit., Did. théol.,* col. 760. —[4] *P. L.,* 182, 1121-1132. [5] *P. Z.,* 183, 775-780.

[6] *P. L.,* 182, 1073-1118.

[7] E. Vacandard, *Vie,* it, p. 373. Seethe whole of chapter 29, p. 348-377. St. Bernard makes no allusion to the famous prophecy attributed to St. Malachy.

[8] *P. L.,* 182, 67-662 (Mabillon's ed., 460 letters). For the remainder, see Vacandard, *Did. théol.,* col. 757-758.

Letter il to Guignes the Carthusian, *on charity,* forms an excellent supplement to the opusculum *De Deo diligendo.*

All these letters are extremely valuable documents as regards both the history *of* the xilth century and that of St. Bernard and his teaching. They have been classed * as follows, according to their subjects : *ecclesiastical* Letters (concerning theology and discipline, the pope and the bishops), *moral* Letters (on the virtues and duties of the laity, especially the princes), and *ascetic* Letters (on the religious life). Some fall under none of these heads and deal with various matters. The chronology of this vast documentation has not yet been finally determined'.

There exist more than 100 prose writings falsely attributed to St. Bernard2. The *Imitation* was not written by him, though much of it has been borrowed from his writings4. The *Memorare* was composed, probably at a later date, from extracts from two of his sermons on the Assumption 5*which were certainly the pious author's source of inspiration. More than 50 *religiousfioems* have been ascribed to him, notably the *Aima Redemptoris Mater* (by Herman Contract,, the *Ave Maris Stella,* the *Salve Regina,* the *Lætabundus exuHet fidelis chorus'*. Several of these hymns, however, would seem to have been inspired by St. Bernard's sermons, such for instance, as the delightful poem *Jesu dulcis memoria 7,* winch repeats, almost to the letter, a number of phrases from his sermons8 9

III. DOCTRINE.

A). The Doctor.

" He is the last of the Fathers and the equal of the greatest " says the learned Mabillon of Bernard 9. This is no exaggerated judgment but an exact rendering of the impression produced by the personality, the works and the teaching of the great doctor. He was a lover of Christian

' In Migne's edition: *P. L.,* 182, 1197-1200.

' See VACANDARD, *Vie,* II, p. 564-567.

3 The whole of vol. 184 of the *L.,* and elsewhere. — 4 See below, p. 707.

5 See VACANDARD, *Vic,* 11, p. 94-95. In Sermon IV, 8, St. Bernard says: " O Blessed Virgin, he who has ever called upon thee in his need and not been heard, may be allowed to say nothing of thy mercy That is the theme of the *Memorare.* See also the sermon for the octave, n. 15. *P. L.,* 183, 428. 438.

See Vacandard, *Vie,* 11, p. 80-81, 95. Cf. Hauréau, *Les poèmes latins attribués à S. Bernard,* Paris, 1890, and Vacandard, *Rev. quest, hist.,* 1891, p. 218-231.

7 Probably written by a Benedictine abbess in the XIVth cent.

8 " Bonus es, Domine, animæ quærenti. Si quærenti, quanto magis invenienti? Si tam dulcis est memoria, qualis eris præsentia? Si mei et lac dulce est sub lingua, quid erit super linguam? *De diversis,* Serm. iv, n. 1. Cf. VACANDARD, *Vie,* π, p. 101.

9 Ultimus inter Patres, primis certe non impar. *Opera, praf. çen.* 23; *P. L.,* 182, 26.

antiquity and his masters were St. Gregory, St. Ambrose and above all St. Augustine'. It would seem indeed to have been part of his mission to remind a century beguiled by dialectics, of the necessity of traditional theology. He himself moreover was "a deeply versed and competent *theologian.* He had no patience for the futile quarrels of the Schools, but true metaphysics held no secrets for him. He had no need to make a gradual approach after a long chain of argument, as did the professional dialecticians who, more often than not, stumbled and lost their way in a gloomy maze of reasoning; Bernard rose straight to the truth, penetrated it intuitively, thanks to the soundness of his theological instinct. Briefly, he threw a searching light on each question and the most skilful were astonished to see him make light of difficulties over which they had grown pale through long years of study" 23

This deeply learned theologian was above all a mystic. He was called *Doctor mellifluus* precisely in order to express that unction which is one of the qualities of the true mystic. This *unction* is a happy blend of alluring tenderness and an insinuating force and sweetness of character. It "tempers the style, making it so suave and penetrating that it reaches the depths of the soul in the manner of divine grace. Bernard possessed this marvellous secret in the highest degree" 3. His learning, moreover, was drawn from a pious study of Holy Writ and from contemplation rather than from philosophy. He considered that the means of attaining God lay not in speculation so much as in *humility** the sister of *truth,* which, in its first degree brings self-knowledge; in its second inspires compassion for others; and finally leads to divine contemplation: 4 these three degrees of the Christian ascesis led Bernard to that sensible contemplative knowledge that is so admirably revealed in his work and which inspired him with some distrust of a more sober learning.

It would be inexact to say that he despised human learning·. He classes those who seek it under four heads: those who wish to make a great name for themselves out of shameful vanity; those who desire to sell their knowledge,and theirs is a base transaction; those who desire knowledge so that they may benefit others, and these are charitable; lastly those who wish to instruct themselves, and these are

* E. Vacandard, *Dici, thiol.,* col. 761. — 2 *Ibid.,* 782.
3 *Ibid.,* 783. — 4 *De grad, hiunil.,* 4-7.

the prudent [1]. The two latter motives he declares are good and legitimate. He is greatly impressed by the misuse that is made of this spiritual food which many acquire in such quantities that they are unable to digest it[2] and thus he comes back to his favourite theme of the overriding need of humility and self-knowledge.

In spile of his prejudice against learning which was due to his knowledge of real abuses, Saint Bernard's mysticism nevertheless had a fortunate influence on the newly born scholasticism. As M. Grabmann judiciously observes, there exists no opposition but rather correlation and parallelism between mysticism and scholasticism [3]. And in addition, the latter owes much to the former where theology is in question, for mysticism serves as a useful counterweight to the impulsive enthusiasms of dialectics; it sheds great light on the capital problem of the relations between science and faith; it makes itself the jealous guardian of the traditional deposit, in the absence of which, theology would soon become a purely human learning; lastly, its suavity tempers all that has a tendency to become too arid and abstract in the scholastic method. In all these matters, as Grabmann points out[4], St. Bernard wielded an efficacious personal authority. He energetically denounced the bold dialecticians who were compromising all theology by their rash methods[5]. He himself was invoked as an authority in various difficult problems. But these occasions were rare. His personal intervention had undoubtedly the most happy results when he triumphantly opposed the rational and perilous tendencies which would have quickly discredited scholasticism. He played the part of the dyke that restrains the flooding river[6]: a humble but nevertheless invaluable function.

Saint Bernard's doctrinal influence was thus chiefly of a spiritual nature. His widespread authority is explained by his spirituality and the whole of his teaching must be brought within this spiritual frame of reference if we are to avoid misinterpreting its meaning or weakening its content. In this sphere the authority of the *Doctor mellifluus* has continued to live in the Church. He, together with St. Augustine in the early Church, has left the strongest impression on Western piety. Since the Middle Ages he has been read and meditated almost as much as the Bishop of Hippo [7]. He inspired the *Imitation of Christ,* the

[1] Sunt qui scire volunt *ut sciantur* ipsi, et turpis curiositas est, qui profecto non evadent subsannantem satyricum et ei <jui ejusmodi est decantantem: *scire luunt nihil est, nisi te scire hoc sciat alter* (Perse, I, 27).—Et sunt item qui scire volunt *ut* scientiam suam *vendant,* verbi causa pro pecunia, pro honoribus, et turpis quæstus est. Sed sunt quoque qui scire volunt *ut adificent,* et charitas est. Et item qui scire volunt ut aedificentur, et prudentia est. *In Cant. Cant.,* XXXvi, 3.

[2] *Ibid., t,* 5.

[3] *Geschichte der scholastichen Methode,* II, p. 94-97.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 98-100. — [5] *Ibid.,* p. 104 sq. —[6] *Ibid.,* p. 10g

[7] E. Vacandard, *Did. théol.,* col. 7S4; Vie, 11, p. 53g

most widely read devotional book in our time, many beautiful passages [1] of which are taken from his works, notably the introductory inscription : *Ama nesciri**. In the following paragraphs we shall consider the essential points of the teaching that make of Bernard one of the most authoritative masters of Catholic spirituality.

B). Saint Bernard's asceticism.

I. Saint Bernard's mysticism has its roots in a solid asceticism, and his asceticism itself—i. e., the study of the *activity* which man must display in order to attain union with God—has for its foundation a firm theological teaching on the relation of grace and freewill. This is to be found in the *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, whose teaching and title are both borrowed from St. Augustine [3].

Like the Bishop of Hippo, Bernard affirms, "that the merits of man are no more than the gifts of God", yet they entail the co-operation of the will: "What is it that saves us? Grace. What, then, of freewill? I answer with a word : it is saved. Take away freewill, there is nothing left to be saved; take away grace, there remains nothing that saves; both, then, are necessary: the one receives, the other acts [4]". He then goes on to render more exact the idea of freewill, both in itself and in the various states through which humanity has passed; the state of nature, the state *of* grace, the state of glory. He maintains that fallen man retains his entire freewill *(etsi miserunt, tamen integrum [5])*. And under the action of grace, it is proper to the will to consent: "Not that this consent in which all merit consists, conies from the will, since of ourselves we are incapable of one good thought, much less a right consent. Yet although this consent is from God and not from us, nevertheless it is not produced in us without our co operation. Grace and freewill act in harmony, and blend their operation so that their indivisible activity is wholly the work of grace and wholly the work of freewill [6]". God causes us to think, will, and accomplish the good act ; the first without us, the second with us, and the third through us [7]. This resolute teaching of St. Bernard on the necessary co-operation of freewill and divine grace, the faithful echo of St. Augustine, is a far cry from the Protestant thesis of faith without

[1] See zW., it, p. 538-539, note.

[3] *huit. J. C.,* I, c. li. Bernard, *in nativ. Domini,* serin, in, c. 2.

[3] See above p. 428. See vol. I, p. 635, and p. 6S4.

[4] *De grat. et lib. arb.,* 1, 2. See E. Vacandard, in *Pensée ch.,* p. 249-250.

[5] *Ibid.,* vin, 24.

[6] *ibid.,* XIV, 47. Mistim, non sigillatine ; simul, non vicissim; non partine gratia, partine liberum arbitrium, sed totum singula opere individuo peragunt.

[7] *Ibid.,* XIV, 46. Deus tria hæc, hoc est bonum cogitare, velle, perficere, operatur in nobis; primum profecto sine nobis; secundum, nobiscum ; tertium, per nos facit. See also ch. XIII : Vacandard. in *Pensée ch.,* p. 251-253.

works so firmly rejected by the Abbot of Clairvaux, despite the contrary affirmation of certain dissidents

Bernard usually takes for granted this moral co-operation of the will with divine grace. But as an ascetic, solicitous to lead souls to perfection, he speaks often and explicitly of the law of progress which seems to be one of the familiar themes of his teaching. "No one can be perfect who does not desire to be more perfect and he shows himself to be more perfect in the measure he aspires to yet higher perfection [1]". Further, the refusal to aspire to greater perfection brings with it the loss of all goodness: "One who refuses to be better is certainly less good and as soon as he refuses to become more perfect he ceases to be good [2]", Bernard proves at length to the Abbot Warin that the lack of desire to advance in perfection is already a retrogression *(nolle proficere, deficere esH)* whilst a constant tending to perfection already implies in a certain manner its possessions. The angels on Jacob's mystic ladder went up and down in order to teach men that in this world there is no alternative to going up and coming down [3].

2. One of the means of progress most recommended by St. Bernard is humility. This virtue seemed to him to be one of the surest ways for quickly attaining perfection.

His little treatise *De gradibus humilitatis et superbia,* written for the purpose of explaining the twelve degrees of humility according to St. Benedict, begins with a long *introduction in q chapters* showing the nature and advantages of this virtue. He defines humility: "Virtus qua homo verissima sui cognitione sibi ipsi vilescit" (ch. i). This provides a notion of perfect humility rather than of humility in general. But he considered that it possessed the advantage of offering to souls a noble goal and in addition emphasized the character of *truth* that was so dear to him. This truth, a result of humility, has three degrees: the first consists in the realisation of one's own wretchedness (ch. iv); the second in compassionating the wretchedness of others (ch. v); the third in the purification of the soul, so that it may contemplate God ;ch. vi;. These three degrees of Truth, the three ways that lead to Truth, are produced in us by the Trinity (ch. Vil). Bernard had the intention of adding

[1] See E. Vacandard, *ibid.,* p. 253-258. *Diet, théol.,* col. 776-779.

[2] Nemo quippe perfectus qui perfectior esse non appetit: et in eo quisque perfectiorem se probat quo ad majorem tendit perfectionem. *Epist.,* 34, i.

Minime pro certo est bonus qui melior esse non vult; et ubi incipis nolle fieri melior, ibi etiam desinis esse bonus. *Epist.,* 91, 3. — [4] *Epist.,* 254, 4.

[3] Jugis conatus ad perfectionem perfectio reputatur. *Ibid* 3 [illegible] In-Cr P.r?.feclu,«.« defectum in hoc statu mortalis vitæ nihil medium invemn. *Ibid.,* 5. Cf. *Epist.,* 91, 3.

another twelve degrees to this first classification'. On second thoughts, however, he decided to show *how perfection is gradually lost by* 1) curiosity; 2) thoughtlessness; 3) foolish mirth; 4) boasting; 5) eccentricity; 6) stubbornness; 7) arrogance; 8) presumption; 9) hypocrisy; 10) revolt; 11) licence; 12) the habit of sin (ch. 9-21). In reality he thus described the degrees of pride. And in his portraits of monks he drew with a firm hand all the irregularities that are born of pride. He who would acquire perfection must rid himself of them one by one, from the last, which are the graver, even to the lesser.

Bernard regarded the religious life as pre-eminently the school of perfection because of the renouncement it exacts and the virtues it teaches, especially obedience [2]. This is the criterion according to which the Abbot of Clairvaux establishes a certain *moral hierarchy* among the religious orders. He did not hesitate to put the Carthusians above the canons regular, and in the Benedictine Order to give first place to the Cistercians since their life is the more austere. In consequence, Bernard admits of a monk changing from a less severe to a more rigid Order, but never the reverse, as that would mean a retrogression [3]. Of all the obligations of the religious life those of *obedience* are perhaps the most sanctifying. They are clearly set out by Saint Bernard who explicitly distinguishes simple transgressions, a result of forgetfulness and which can hardly be called faults *(vix peccatum reputatur),* from formal contempt of authority, the rule, or the superior; a contempt that springs from pride and which must also be distinguished from negligence, a result of indolence, and as such, much less blameworthy [4].

3. Any synthetic exposition of St. Bernard's teaching that failed to allot a large place to the love of God would suffer from serious defects. St. Bernard's is a smiling austerity; he looks upon the thorns of penance as no more than the guardians of the sweet-scented rose of charity. In no part of his work is this love to be vainly sought. In his sermons on the *Canticle oj Canticles* [5] he glorifies the mystic heights. Nor does he address himself to the perfect

[1] These three degrees may be regarded as the *three ways* of the spiritual lite according to the classic division. See also below the beginning of the love of God according to St. Bernard.

[3] See the treatise *De precepto et dispensatione.* Cf. Vacandard, in *Pensée ch.,* p. 42-44; *Diet, théol.,* col. 755-756.

[3] *De precepto et disp.,* c. 15. — [4] *Ibid.,* c. 5-15.

[5] *See* below, *Mysticism,* p. 438.

alone. He exhorts the Christian to love from the outset of his spiritual life, and describes its genesis and progress in his letter to Guigues the Carthusian [1] and in his fine treatise *De diligencio Deo* in which he comments what he thought to be one of St. Augustine's expressions[2]: the measure of the love of God is to love Him beyond all measure: "Causa diligendi Deum Deus est; modus, sine modo diligere".

In the *first seven chapters* the motives for loving God are eloquently set forth; i. e., His infinite perfections and His love for us. The *latter part of the book,* ch. 8-15 is chiefly occupied with the beginnings, the progress and the consummation of this love in our souls. Its foundation is that natural love we already possess (called by Bernard the first degree *of* the love of God; but this expression is inexact). Grace transforms and renders supernatural this natural love, causing God to be loved *a)* for His blessings, *b)* for His blessings and His own goodness, *c)* solely for Himself. Thus, according to St. Bernard the four degrees of love are: 1. love of self; 2. mercenary love; 3. filial love; 4. pure love (mainly beatific)[3][4].

One of the forms or forces of love consists in *devotions*[4]. The human nature of Jesus Christ had a special attraction for the soul of Saint Bernard: and this devotion gave rise in its turn to a tender love of *Mary.* On these points he has had a great influence on modern spirituality. "The great novelty, the incomparable religious achievement of the Middle Ages", it has been said[5], "is the understanding and the love, the impassioned devotion to the humanity of Christ. The Incarnate Word is become not only a model to be imitated, a guide to be followed and on the other hand, the uncreated light that illuminates the very depths of the soul; He *is* those very depths as regards His humanity[6]: He is the *spouse* of the soul, acting with and in the soul; He is the *friend".* St. Bernard was the pioneer of the movement which was to bring souls to this intimacy with Christ, the Man-God. Saint Francis of Assisi and the

[1] *Epist.* xi.

[2] This phrase is from Severus of Milevum. *Inter Epist.* Augustini, *Ep.* 109.

[3] Compare this classification of the degrees of *love* with that of the previously mentioned degrees of *truth.* See also *In Cantie.·,* serm. 20.

[4] See P. POURRAT, *Op. cit.,* p. 59-76. Splendid extracts.

[5] *Christus,* 1906 edit., p. 1119-1121. What is new here is hardly a creation so much as a special intensity of devotion. [11]

[6] Not by means of a *real* presence as in communion, but by way of a *spiritual presence,* based on the universal operation of Christ's human nature in sanctifying souls, as well as the permanent nature of His hypostatic union with God Who dwells especially m holy souls.

Imitation did but quicken it. The best development of St. Bernard's ideas are to found in his sermons "for the liturgical seasons He was attracted by all the mysteries of the life of Christ but more particularly by the *childhood* of Jesus [1] which he has so charmingly sung ("O parvule, parvulis desiderate!"), His *passion,* all the details of which fired him with compassionate love[2], and His blessed name, whose syllables alone made him leap for joy [3]. In glowing phrases, especially in his sermons, he dwells on the love that Jesus showed us in His passion that He might draw forth our love for Him, though he is careful not to reduce the dogma of the Redemption to that alone, as is well seen in his criticism of Abelard [4].

His devotion to Mary [5] was the fruit of that which he had for Jesus. Yet Bernard who spread and practised this devotion in so great a measure was led by his abhorrence of all innovations to protest against the introduction of the feast of the Immaculate Conception at Lyons; his letter 174 (to the canons of Lyons), not only rejects the feast but denies the immaculate nature of this conception[6]. Bernard associates all Mary's privileges with her *Divine Motherhood.* Two virtues, especially, he says, made her pleasing in the sight of God: humility and virginity; "Though she pleased by her virginity, she conceived through her humility" [7]. Not only is Mary herself full of grace, but also for us: "Plena sibi, nobis superplena et supereffluens" [8]. She is the *dispenser ofgraces:* "Sic est voluntas ejus qui totum nos habere voluit per Mariam" [9]: she is the canal that brings

[1] See mainly the sermons for Christmas and Epiphany.

[3] See the sermons for Holy Week.

[3] See the sermons for the Circumcision and also *In Cant.,* serm. 15, 3-6. For the hymn *festi dulcis memoria,* cf. above, p. 430.

[4] See above, p. 419 and p. 424. Bernard affirms the "identity" of all men with the Redeemer Whose innocent blood has washed away our sins; not that the Father desired this blood but he consented to its voluntary oblation for our salvation: "*Non requisivit Pater sanguinem Filii, sed tamen acceptavit oblatum;* non sanguinem sitiens *sed salutem".—Non mors* sed *voluntas placuit sponte morientis".* Thus does Bernard reply to Abelard's objections. He insists less on the theory of satisfaction developed by St. Anselm than on the Fathers' idea of penal substitution. See J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 333-339. On the power of the devil see *ibid.,* p. 465-471.

[5] See P. Bourrât, *op. cit.,* p. 76-89. E. Vacandard, *Penséechr.,* p. 226-234.

[6] See X. Le Bachelet, *Immac. Cone.,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1010-1015. For Abelard's contrary thesis see above p. 421.

[7] Super *Missus est,* horn. I, 5. — [8] *In Assumpt.,* II, 2.

[9] *In nativ. Maria, 7.*

to us the heavenly waters. And the holy abbot adds [1]: "She is the ladder of sinners; there is my supreme trust, the reason of all my hope" [2].

4. The spirit of prayer in the early and particularly Benedictine spiritnality was mainly nourished by the liturgical life. But Bernard towards the end of his life, desirous of giving to Eugene III, a man wholly absorbed in the duties of his office, the means of constantly refreshing himself in the interior life, devised an exercise leadine directly to that meditation that was later codified by St. Ignatius. This was the *De Consideratione.*

In the first book Bernard shows the need and the advantages of consideration. At the beginning of the second, he assigns to it four objects that are dealt with in the remainder of the work: "Tibi considerandа rcor: *te* (bk. 11); quæ *sub te* (the Universal Church, bk. Ill); quæ *circa te* (the Roman curia, bk. iv); quæ *supra te* sunt (God, bk. v)". Consideration is thus concerned with moral subjects (knowledge of self: *quid est quis? qualis?;* knowledge of the duties of one's state), and with doctrinal subjects (in book V). In each case this exercise adopts a very different form. When duties are in question consideration consists in a kind of *examination* in foresight and careful surveillance, and St. Bernard rightly (bk. 11, c. 2) distinguishes it from contemplation. But when there is question of God and the spiritual realities that should ever be present to the mind, he identifies consideration with *contemplation.* The latter he envisages, not, as a certain writer puts it[3], as the illuminative life of passive prayer in the proper sense of the term, but as a loving study, a noble prayer, a true affective or contemplative meditation in quest of God, and which ultimately finds Him, when grace is given to fructify study and prayer: "At orando forte quam disputando dignius *quæritur,* et facilius *invenitur*" [4]. The mystical element is grace rather than consideration itself; the latter at least prepares the way, and is thus far from negligible.

C) Saint Bernard's mysticism [5].

I. Mysticism finds its place in all the foregoing treatises; but it is mainly found, treated oratorically rather than methodically, in the Commentary in the Canticle of Canticles. The author's exegesis is obviously allegorical. He regards the Canticle as a marriage song singing the mystical union of the Man-God with the Church and the faithful soul. Even here, moreover, *asceticism* has a large place. Bernard

[1] *Ibid.* — [2] Vacandard, EA, 11, p. 87-96.

[3] In a wide sense, however, "consideration may be termed mystic". See below. — [4] *Consid.*, v, 14, end.

[5] E. Vacandard, *iie,* 1, p. 471-474; *Diet. théol.,* 479-480, in *Pensée chr.,* p. 266-275.

indicates the means by which the union is prepared and the various stages that lead up to it. The *love of Christ* plays an important part 1. St. Bernard distinguishes that love which has for its object the human nature of the Savioui and which he calls *sensible love (sensibilis, carnalis),* and that which sees the divine element in the person of Jesus; the latter is a *spiritual love,* more perfect than the preceding and the real principle of union with God 2. It should be realised however that these two loves are not exclusive : sensible love leads to spiritual love; and when the latter is engendered in the soul it gives rise to the love of the human nature of Christ, which St. Bernard calls sensible, but which, by its depth, its fineness and its power has much in common with spiritual love with which it is intimately blended and wholly penetrated 3. A living proof of this is the work of the Abbot of Clairvaux.

2. The most outstanding elements of this spiritual love render it truly mystical. Its proper object "is not the Incarnate Word so much as the Word wisdom, the Word justice, the Word truth, the Word holiness, piety, power *(virtus)* "4;* in a word, *God,* Who took our human nature that He might become our wisdom, our justice our sanctification, our redemptions. Made greater than " sensible " love by its proper object, it is also greater by its more powerful results 6, no less than by the "fullness of the Spirit"7 that it supposes and which forms its "prerogative"; for God can only be loved in this way by souls that know Him, who in truth "perceive the things of the Spirit". Such is the food, too strong for the carnal, that is fitting for the spiritual soul. It is provided by the Holy Ghost: "He nourishes us with the bread of life and understanding, and gives us to drink of the salutary water of wisdom. For the understanding of the spiritual

1 See *In Cant.,* semi. 20. At the outset Bernard declares that the love of Christ, following Christ's own example, must possess three qualities (n. 3): "Disce amare *dulciter,* amare *prudenter,* amare *fortiter.* Dulciter, ne illecti, prudenter, ne decepti, fortiter ne oppressi, ab amore Domini avertamur. — Ne mundi gloria, vel carnis voluptatibus abducaris, dulcescat tibi præ his *sapientia* Christus : ne deducaris spiritu mendacii et erroris, lucescat tibi *veritas* Christus; ne adversitatibus fatigeris, confortet te *virtus* Dei Christus" (n. 4).

3 Same sermon, 6-9. Having spoken ardently of the *love of Christ's humanity* (n. 6), whose purpose is to nourish souls " while they are yet unable to perceive the things of the Spirit " (n. 7) and declared that this devotion is a *gift,* "a great gift of the Spirit" (n. 8), St. Bernard shows that this love is very inferior to *spiritual love,* both in its *object* and its *effects* (n. 8) as well as in its supernatural character, since the latter supposes a veritable fullness of the Spirit (n. 9).

3 St. Bernard says himself that " carnal " love *also* becomes spiritual, "efficitur *ettatn* spiritualis ", after having become " rationalis ". *Ibid.,* n. 9.

4 *Ibid.,* 8. — 5 *Ibid.,* n. 9.

6 *Ibid..* S. — 7 *Ibid.,* 9.

and invisible realities is the true bread of the soul "*, and this bread is changed to drink by the gift of wisdom a. Further, the Holy Ghost never enlightens without giving birth to love: "Spirit of wisdom and understanding, He is like to the bee that carries wax and honey"1; He is like a divine "kiss" and "the knowledge that is given in a kiss is accepted with love, for the kiss is an expression of love"4. This kiss, this gift of God from the Holy Ghost is *contemplation* taken in the strict sense of a mystical grace5; it gives rise in the soul to spiritual love which, in its own way, prolongs and continues the gift of this contemplation.

Christ, *the Word,* reveals Himself especially in contemplation6 and St. Bernard delights in considering Him as the Spouse of the holy soul. He it is, Who, by means of spiritual love, unites Himself to souls when they respond to His advances by the full agreement of their will with His 7. "What is there more sweet than this conformity? what more desirable than the love by which, not content with human learning, O my soul, thou art able trustfully to approach the Word, ever unite thyself to the Word, converse familiarly with the Word, above all consult Him, as urgent with thine understanding as thou art bold with thy desire. In very truth, a spiritual and holy marriage is made in this sort"8. Innumerable are the passages in which the holy abbot has described in terms as bold as they are delicate the sweetness of this mysterious espousal. One of the most often quoted is sermon S3 on the Canticle. "It is perhaps", says Vacandard, "the finest hymn of love that has ever echoed in the cloister walls. It should be read in its entirety"9.10

Saint Bernard has often described, as one with personal experience, the mysterious meetings of the holy soul with God in those orisons in which love is quickened. These encounters take place within *the soul itself*,0, on occasions when not only is the soul purified but also recollected and at peace; wisdom reigns within the depths of the soul and forms the resting place of God, Who, when He descends" brings peace to all things: *Tranquillus Deus tranquillat omnia*™. It is there that Christ gives the Spirit to the soul, *his kiss* *3, a kiss from

1 Est enim intellectus rerum spiritualium et invisibilium verus animæ panis. *In Annuiti.,* serin. Il, 4. — 2 *Ibid.* — 3 *In Cant,,* vili, 6.

4 Et bene scientia quæ in osculo datur, cum amore recipitur; quia amoris indicium osculum est. *Ibid.*—Doctrina Spiritus non curiositatem acuit, sed charitatein accendit. *Ibid.*

5 "Consideration" of which we have written above (p. 438) is a mystical prayer only in a wide sense, inasmuch as it disposes to this grace or prolongs its effects.

6 Fit autem contemplatio ex condescensione *Terbi Dei* ad humanam naturam per gratiam. *De diversis,* serm. 87, η. β.

7 Talis conformitas maritat animam Verbo, cum, cui videlicet similis est per naturam, similem nihilominus se exhibet per voluntatem, diligens sicut dilecta est. Ergo si perfecte diligit, nupsit. *Iit Cant.,* S3, n. 3. M

B *Ibid.* Vere spiritualis sanctique connubii contractus est iste.

9 In *Pensée ch., op. cit.,* p. 297. See *ibid.,* p. 273-275.

10 *In Cant.* semi. 46, η. 5-S.

11 *Ibid.,* serm. 23, η. 14-15. — 13 *Ibid.,* 16.

'3 *Ibid.,* semi. 8, n. 2 sq. «1

His divine mouth [1]. Those alone who have experienced it can know the sweetness[2] of this divine embrace. Bernard knew of its grandeur and calls on the soul to admit itself unworthy of so great a favour; and yet he continues to exhort the soul to desire it and plead for it humbly. Lastly, after tears and prayers, "we shall perhaps dare to raise our heads towards these glorious lips, trembling and quaking I say it, not only to look upon them but to kiss them"[3]. And when Christ deigns to satisfy this pious desire, St. Bernard cries: "O happy kiss in which not only do we recognise a God, but also love a Father"[4]. He also devoted admirably written pages to the familiar *conversations* that the soul holds with Christ in these hours of grace[5]. He also describes even greater favours, at least as regards their intensity; *ravishments* or ecstasies[6]. In these there is something more divine *(divinius)* but it passes away with the swiftness of lightning [7]. Yet even then, no matter how piercing the divine light that bathes the soul, God does not show Himself face to face[8]. And though the privileged soul is now armed against sin[9], such favours are but momentary[10].

3. These last graces contain many extraordinary elements that it would be rash to desire. It did not even occur to Bernard to touch upon them, so taken up was he in inspiring a holy purpose in his monks. He urged them on to that state of perfection to which God calls all souls and for the accomplishment of which He has provided them with pre-eminent graces which St. Bernard never tires of describing; all the commentaries on the *Canticle* have no other end in view. No doubt there is an order to be observed, special ways to follow ; but in the end Bernard shows Christ to all : "to Whom we unite ourselves in a holy embrace, so that by His grace we may become one spirit" with Him;[11][12] he states that God offers this favour even to those who are unfortunate enough to be unfaithful [13]. In addition, Bernard's purpose in encouraging the practice of contemplation was also because he saw in it a school of eloquence [43] and *a support for the apostolic life*[14]. Before he can act as a canal the priest must be a reservoir continually replenished at the inexhaustible fount of wisdom. Such

[1] St. Bernard distinguishes three kisses, that *of the feet,* granted by Christ to converted souls; that *of the hands* vouchsafed to souls on the path of progress *(proficientes) ;* lastly that *of the mouth,* the privilege of the perfect. Serin 3 and 4.

[2] *Ibid.,* semi. 3, I. — [3] *Ibid.,* 5-6. — [4] *Ibid.,* semi. 8, n. 9.

[5] See *ibid.,* serin. 45. — [6] *Ibid.,* semi. 41, 3; 52, 4.

[7] *Ibid.,* 41, 3. — [8] *Semi.,* 18, 5. — [9] *Ibid.,* 52, 4.

[10] *Epist.* ii, 8. Quietism was destined to neglect imprudently much of the caution of the Abbot of Clairvaux. — " *Ibid.,* semi. 3, 5.

[12] *Ibid.;* semi. 84. On this point, see A. Saudreau, *op. cit.,* p. 133-140. Desire of contemplation and divine union. — [43] *Ibid.,* serin. 41, 5.

[14] *Ibid.,* serin. 85, 12. Cf. serm. 50 and 57, 8-9.

is the condition of supernatural fecundity. Bernard taught it by his example, and his doctrinal action that has lasted through the centuries is but the prolongation of his contemplative *life*.

CHAPTER V.

The School of St Victor.

Special bibliography.

Editions: *P. L., 175-177* (Hugh), 196 (Richard). Studies: B. Hauréau, *Hugues de S.-V,* Paris, 1859; *Les œuvres de H., essai critique,* Paris, 1886. A. Mignon, *Les origines de la scoi, et Hugues de S.-V.,* Paris, 1895. M. Grabmann, *Die Gesch. der schol. Methode,* II, Freiburg, 1911, p. 229-309. J. DE Ghellinck, *Le mouvement thlologique du XIIe siècle,* p. 112-121, 355-369. G. ROBERT, *Les Ecoles et renseignement de la théologie...,* passini. Th. HEITZ, *Essai historique, p. 71-84.* J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la rédemption,* p. 339-342 and 474·475 (Hugh), 351-353 (Richard). U. Baltüs, *Dieu, d'après H. de S.-V.,* in *Rev. ben.,* 1898, p. 109-123, 200-214. P. POURRAT, *La théologie sacramentaire,* passim; *La spiritualité chrétienne,* II, p. 148-192. A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu, p.* 154-168. F. VERNET, *Hugues de S.-Victor,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 240-308. On Richard, sec especially Hugonin, in *P. L.,* 196, xiv-xxxii. *Daunou,* in *Hist. litt. France,* XIII (1814), p. 472-488. E. KULESZA, *La doctrine mystique de R. de S.-V.,* in *Vie spirit.,* (suppi.), 1924 (series of articles).

I. HUGH OF SAINT VICTOR.

The XIHth century saw the opening in *Paris,* by the *side of* the ancient episcopal school, two other schools that were destined to rival it in their zeal for study, and to make of the French capital the greatest university town of the Middle Ages. These were the schools of Saint Victor, founded by the famous leader of the realists, William of Champeaux, weary of his dialectic combats, and that of *Saint Genevieve,* set up almost at the same time by Abelard, the better to harass his erstwhile master, even in his retreat. The School of Saint Victor is mainly represented by two men, *Hugh* and *Richard.*

Hugh appears to have been born a little before 1100, for he came to Saint Victor at the age of eighteen between 1115

and **II**18. He was probably a native of Saxony [*]. In 1133 he was macle director of studies in the monastery. He taught there with great success though he appears to have had no other pupils besides the monks of the monastery. The list of his works bears witness to the extent of his learning and his devotion to study. He was in correspondence with Saint Bernard to whom he put questions relative to Abelard's theories, and from whom he received a reply in the form of the little treatise *De baptismo.* The School of Saint Victor was in complete doctrinal sympathy with St. Bernard. Nothing more is known of Hugh's life. He was possibly prior of his abbey as well as director of studies. He died in r 141 in odour of sanctity.

A). Theolog'ical works. Doctrine.

Hugh of Saint Victor owed his widespread fame to his work De Sacramentis christianæ fidei[2] whose sturdy and original composition, literary perfection and especial fullness and depth of subject matter made of it, " the first great complete system of dogmatic theology during the era of high scholasticism " [3]. It consists of an *introduction* to the Scriptures, written for clerks who were about to begin *allegorical interpretation,* i. e., the study of the Bible from a *doctrinal viewpoint* after having previously studied it from the historical angle. The work is divided into *two books.* 1'he first forms a preparation to the study of the Incarnation; the second treats of the Incarnation and its consequences. Both the historical and theoretical method is followed throughout the work.

The 1st book is subdivided into *12 parts,* in which, after an introduction on the knowledge of Holy Writ, the following subjects are treated in order: *A)* 1. the work of the creation ; 2. the author of the creation; 3. knowledge of the divinity; 4. the divine, eternal, and manifested will; *B)* 5. the creation of the angels and their fall; 6. the creation of man and his first innocence; 7. his fall ; 8. his redemption as willed by God; *C) g.* the institution of the *sacraments;* 10. faith; il. natural law; 12. lastly the written law.

The Hnd book is subdivided into 18 parts, treating: *A)* 1. Christ and 2. the Church, His body; 3. various ecclesiastical orders and functions; 4. symbolic meaning of the sacred vestments and 5. the dedication of churches; *B) (sacraments)* : 6. baptism ; 7. confirmation ;

[1] According to another opinion he was horn in Flanders, while yet another makes his birthplace in Lorraine. Cf. F. Vernet, *o/>. cit.,* col. 240-241.

[2] *P. L., Г]6,* 173-618. — [3] M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte,* 11, p. 259.

8. the Eucharist; 9. lesser sacraments (various rites) and 10. their profanation by simony; 11. marriage; 12. vows, virtues and vices; 14. confession and penance; 15. extreme unction; *C) (the last things):* 16. the end of man; 17. the end of the world; 18. the world to come.

Hugh often understands by sacrament the holy things figured in Holy Writ; in short, the whole of theology *(tota divinitas)* r; such is the meaning of his great treatise and also a short DIALOGUE, *De sacramentis legis naturalis et scriptæ*. But he also takes the word in the sense of holy things that directly tend to the sanctification of the soul: " Corporale elementum foris sensibiliter propositum, ex similitudine repraesentans, ex institutione significans, et ex sanctificatione continens spiritualem gratiam " a. He thus contributed considerably to the growth of sacramentara doctrine. Unfortunately he dwells at too great length on the *matter* of the sacrament and thus fails to give a clear idea of the composition of the sacred rite and a perfect enumeration of the sacraments. He nevertheless prepared the ground for the eventual distinction of sacraments from sacramentáis by his classification of sacred rites as major or principal sacraments, and minor sacraments, as well as by the special importance he assigned to those that were shortly to be classed among the *seven* 3.

In addition to these two writings *De sacramentis,* Hugh composed a fairly considerai number of other theological works 4 concerning dogmatic or moral theology, among which may be mentioned:

1. *Eruditio didascalica.* introduction to the study of the liberal arts and Holy Writ, in 6 books. Book VII in the editions is really a separate work *De operibus trium dierum* 6.

2. *De quinque septenis seu septenariis*7 an opusculum treating briefly of *a)* the seven capital sins; *b)* the seven petitions of the Pater; *c)* the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost; *d)* the seven principal virtues; *e)* the seven beatitudes. There is no question of the seven sacraments.

* *Erud. didasc.,* vi, 4.

3 *De sacrant.,* I, p. IX, c. 2.

3 Ci. P. Pourrat, *La théol. sacr.,* p. 34-37, 60-62. F. Vernet, *loc. cit.,* col. 280-281.

4 The list of his works is known from an *Indiculum* previous to 1155; edited by J. DE Ghellinck, *Rech, setene, rei.,* 1910, p. 277-283. Cf. *ibid.,* p. 270-289, 385-396. *Rev. néo-scol.,* 19x3, p. 226-239.

5 The original title appears to have been Didascalion ; *P. L.,* 176 720-81·'

6 *Ibid.,* 811-838.

7 *P. L.,* 175, 405-414. '.Tj·

3. Diverse *opuscula* (occasional sermons or lectures) on Christ [1]* or the Blessed Virgin [3] or moral questions[3].

4. *Exegetical writings* that may also be classed with his theological writings : they consist either of preliminary or explanatory notes, or homilies and commentaries[4][5]

Apart from a few defects and unavoidable gaps [5] Hugh's theology as a whole makes a real advance on the teaching of his forerunners. We will content ourselves here with an outline of his teaching on the Church and the relation between faith and reason.

As became a fervent Augustinian, Hugh gave a large part in his teaching to the Church [6]. Like St. Augustine he was fond of considering the Church *in its relation to God* and to Christ, writing of it as the house of God, the city of the King, the body of Christ, the spouse of the lamb, like Christ himself the main object of the Scriptures, the end of all creation and the ark of salvation in which God is joined to man[7]. As a consequence of this he considered that no one really belonged to the Church who lacked *grace* and *charity:* "Soli autem homines gratiæ et *in* Ecclesia sunt et *de* Ecclesia sunt"[8]. Charity is the source of *unity* in the Church [9],[10] as also is faith which makes for holiness under the lifegiving operation of the Holy Ghost: hence the famous definition : " Ecclesia sancta corpus est Christi uno Spiritu vivificata, et unita fide una, et sanctificata" [10]. Nevertheless Hugh does not conceive the Church as purely spiritual : he gives a perfect description of the rights and obligations of the *hierarchy* the authority of the latter is quite different from the secular power. It is really superior to temporal power without in any way trespassing on the

[1] *De Verbo incarnalo, P. L.,* 177, 315-324; *De quatuor voluntatibus in Xto, De saf>ientia anima Xti; P. L·,* 176, 841-846; 845-856.

[2] *De virginitate, De annuntiatione, De assumptione, P. L.,* 176, 857-876; 177, 656-657 ; 1209-1222.

[3] *Institutiones in decalogum, P. L.,* 176, 9-18. Chap. 5 is a short independent treatise : *De substantia dilectionis et caritate ordinata. {Ibid.,* 5-18).

[4] Chiefly in *P. L.,* 175. A collection called *Miscellanea* contains far more apocryphal than authentic elements.

[5] He considered that Original Sin consisted in concupiscence rather than the privation of grace, since he did not think that Adam possessed the strictly supernatural *gifts,* unless he included them in the knowledge of God *per presentían contemplationis* that he ascribes to him; see p. 449. His Christological doctrine was profound ; he exaggerated however in identifying Christ's human knowledge with His divine; without any lapse however into Apollinarianism. He followed St. Anselm on the Redemption, but makes it clear that God could have saved man without the Incarnation. Cf. F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* 274-2S0.

[6] See chiefly the *De sacramentis* and the two treatises on spirituality "*De arca Noe* "'.

[7] *De arca Noe morali,* 11, 8; col. 642. — [8] *De arca Noe mystica,* v; col. 690.

[9] Caritas unitas est Ecclcsiæ... Sive caritatem sive unitatem nomines, idem est, quia unitas est caritas et caritas unitas. *De sacr.,* bk. II, p. xm, 11, coi. 544.

[10] *De sacr.,* bk. II, p. II, 2, coi. 416. — " *Ibid.,* p. III.

latter's domain ' and yet it is more than a mere moral guidance or even an indirect authority. With regard to the State, the Church has a double function : to set it up and subsequently judge it when it acts wrongly[1]. These formulas corresponding to the social order of the Middle Ages, should be compared with contemporary witnesses to the same subject[3]. Hugh also claims for the Church *a doctrinal authority* that the theologian must hold in great respect : this authority is especially seen in the councils and general teaching of the Church*. Though he rarely quotes the Fathers, he knew them so well that he has even been charged with comparing them to the inspired writers[5].

In addition to being an eminent theologian, mystic, and lover of tradition, Hugh was also a philosopher[6,7]. He made clear the relations of faith and reason. Contrary to what has been averred by some, he did not confuse the two orders of knowledge, natural and supernatural. God Himself, he says, may be known either by reason, according to the two manners that are natural to it *(ad naturam pertinent)* or by revelation according to two other, supernatural, ways *(pertinent ad gratiam)**. In his rational demonstration of God's existence, Hugh leaves aside the *a priori* processes and bases his argument on experience, either internal (the soul is conscious of its existence and of a beginning of self-knowledge from which it concludes that it derives its being from another who must be *a semetipso)* or external (same argument based on the contingent character of external realities)[9]*. These demonstrations are purely rational and make no appeal to revelation[10]. Revelation of the truths of faith also takes place, cither by means of internal inspiration of external teaching (facts and words) ". It would appear that Hugh sometimes attempts to give a real demonstration of the truths, even of the mystery *of* the Trinity[13]; but it should be observed that he always presupposes faith, and his proof is based on a mere ‘‘vestigium" that furnishes no more than a congruent argument. His radical expressions *[3] therefore must not be taken too literally. Similar formulas are found even in the most rigid theologians, such as, for instance, St. Thomas.

1 Spiritualis potestas non ideo præsidet ut terrena? in suo jure præjudicium faciat. *De sacr.,* II, p. n, 7.

Nam spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem et instituere habet ut sit et judicare si bona non fuerit. *De sacr.,* II, p. 11, 4, coi. 418.

' See below, p. 676. F. VERNET, *op. cil.,* col. 269-271.

4 See chiefly the *Eruditio didascalia,* books IV-V.

5 F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 271-273.

6 Hugh was tolerant enough to commend the study of all the liberal arts: “ Omnia disce, videbis postea nihil esse superfluum. Coarctata scientia jucunda non est ‘. *Erud. didas.,* VI, 3, col. Soi. He recommended a continual quest for a better understanding of truth, all truth, above all, God, Who is ‘‘our native soil and our fatherland " (humus namque et patria nostra Deus est). *Arca Noe mor.,* III, 4. col. 650. Cf. *De sacr.,* II, p. XIV, 9, col. 570 sq.

7 Cf. F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 258-263.

8 *De sacr.,* I, p. m, 31 (a summary of all this part); see the whole.

9 *Ibid.,* c. 6-10.

See F. Vernet, *ibid.*. 259, against an erroneous interpretation by Heitz.

" *De sacr., did.,* c. 31. — « *Ibid.,* 19.31. — «3 Cf. F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* 267-269.

B). Spiritual works. Teaching·.

Hugh's works on spirituality comprise, in addition to the long commentary of the *Celestial Hierarchy* of Dionysius the Areopagite[1] (of no great value) and two opuscula on *monastic training,* a double trilogy dealing mainly with *prayer* and the *interior life* in general.

On the monastic life : 1. *De institutione novitiorumP* (mainly about exterior characteristics : gait, behaviour, modesty, politeness) ; 2. *Expositio in Regulam B. Augustini* an admirably moderate explanation of the letter and spirit of the Rule.

The following opuscula are devoted to prayer in general:

1. *De meditando*[4] classes meditation under three heads, accordingly as it has for subject creatures, the Scriptures, or morality. The author makes useful practical suggestions.

2. *De modo orandi*[5] piously treats of the conditions and degrees of true prayer, borne up on the two wings of man's misery and the mercy of the Saviour (c. 1).

3. *Soliloquium de arrha aninice*[6] is a delightful address to a soul ravished by the love of God, its heavenly Spouse, Who grants it proofs of His tenderness in spiritual favours by means of which He occasionally allows Himself to be felt *(se tibi ad gustandum preebet),* pending thè vision in heaven and perfect union.

The interior life in general is studied in three treatises that appear to form a logical and methodical whole.

1. *De vantiate mundi et rerum transeuntium usu*[1] points out how dangerous for man is the love of the world and shows that the remedy is the love of God, the ark of salvation.

2. *De arca Noe morali** reveals this spiritual ark in the *soul* itself, inasmuch as it is the temple of God (bk. I, c. 2) in the *Church,* His kingdom (c. 4), and especially in *wisdom* (bk. 11-in). Book iv shows how God reveals himself to those that love Him.

3. *De arca Noe mystica*** develops the same doctrine with the aid of a continual ‘‘symbolism ”, which, however, is explained by the author.

Λ number of other writings on spirituality easily fall under the above heads.

1 *L.,* 175, 923-1154. — ' Λ *L.,* 925-952.

3 *P. I.., ibid.,* 881-924. This treatise, omitted in the *Indiculum* is quite authentic and has always been held in great regard by the Augustinians.

4 ⁄. *L., ibid.,* 993-998 *(De meditandi artificio opusculum aureum).* Should not be confused with the *De modo dicendi et meditandi* (a later collection of authentic texts)., *ibid.,* 877-880.

5 *P. L., ibid.,* 977-988 (8 chapters). See also the commentary of the Pater *(P. I..,* 175» 774'7^9^ *Orationis dont. expositio).*

6 *P. L.,* 176, 951-970. The word ‘‘soliloquy”, meant for the early writers an interior conversation *of* man, either with the soul, or with God.

7 *P. L., ibid.,* 703-740 (4 books). — 8 *P. L., ibid.,* 617-680.

9 *P. L., ibid.,* 681-704.

1. The allegorism of the mystical ark is also found in the admirable contemplative meditation *De operibus trium dierum* (now added, as bk. vu, to the *Eruditio ').*

2. The mystical union is described, as in the Soliloquy, in the *Dt amore sponsi ad sponsant*l and the *De laude caritatis*3*.

3. The *i() homilies on Ecclesiastes**· deal mainly with moral theology, with many mystical applications5.

The remaining spiritual writings ascribed to Hugh of Saint Victor are not authentic6.7

To judge from his teaching Hugh was *a mystici* in the full meaning of the word. The attention he paid to contemplation is sufficient witness of this. It is important however to seize the exact sense he gives to this word. He thus defines it Contemplatio est vivacitas illa intelligentiæ quæ cuneta in palam habens manifesta visione comprehendit"8. It will be seen that in religious contemplation, of which we are speaking, love plays an essential part. First, however, we must distinguish, as does the author himself, contemplation from meditation.— MEDITATION implies an effort, a quest *(quærit),* whilst the former implies possession *(possidet);* further, meditation, to be a true prayer, must be piously performed *(pia devotione) :* it is thus that it achieves its purpose, the kindling of the flame of divine love. This love burns up the unruly passions, strengthens and appeases the mind and sets it to contemplation 9. This latter is first manifested

* *P. L., ibid.,* 811-838. — 3 *P. L., ibid.,* 987-994.
3 *P. L., ibid.,* 969-976. — 4 *P. E,* 175, 113-256.
5 Idea of contemplation inasmuch as it is distinguished from meditation.
6 Such are : De fructibus carnis et spiritus; De claustro animæ; De medicina animæ, etc. ; a symbolic work *(De bestiis),* which is one of the finest bestiaries of the Middle Ages; a hundred sermons. Several philosophical writings have also been attributed to him.
7 For Hugh the word *mystic* usually means *symbolic.* The term *contemplation,* as he uses it, seems to connotate what we would call the mystical graces. Cf· P* 359·
8 *In Eccles.,* horn. I, col. 117. *Another definition:* Contemplatio est perspicax et liber animi contuitus in res perspiciendas usquequaque diffusus. *Ibid.*
' Si quando aliquam divini timoris seu dilectionis scintillam conceperit, *primum* quidem pravis desideriis reluctantibus passionum et perturbationum fumus exoritur : *deinde* roborata mente cum flamma amoris et validius ardere et clarius splendere coeperit, mox omnis perturbationum caligo evanescit, et jam pura mente animus ad contemplationem veritatis se diffundit. *Novissime* autem postquam assidua veritatis contemplatione cor penetratum fuerit et ad ipsum summae veritatis fontem medullitus toto animæ affectu intraverit, tunc in idipsum dulcedinis (fontem) quasi totum ignitum et in ignem amoris conversum, ab omni strepitu et perturbatione pacalissimum, requiescit. *Ibid.,* col. 117-118.

in an imperfect form which Hugh calls SPECULATION : it is characterised by wonder and is proper to those who, having overcome the passions, begin to see truth in a new light and are struck by its novelty [1]. TRUE CONTEMPLATION to which the previous exercise disposes, is more perfect. Now, the soul is filled with deep peace, having found truth in which it rests in perfect charity; then "is the whole heart changed into love; it is truly felt that God is all to all, and He is welcomed with so great a love that nothing but Him remains in the heart... The wonderful suavity that the soul experiences wholly transforms it to joy and happiness" [2]. Such is the charity that makes the soul the spouse of God [3] and brings to it at times [4] those visits of the Spouse that fill it with love. These immense spiritual favours, in which contemplation truly consists, are the privilege of the perfect. A foretaste of heaven, they are also " even in this life ", a reward for those who have earnestly sought God; they are the mark of perfection [5]. This manner of prayer is wholly supernatural, infused and passive[6], unlike speculation which is active and allied to meditation though it is also, as Hugh remarks, usually accompanied by a spiritual joy and splendour that ravish the soul and cause it to feel all the vanity of the world [7].

The doctrine of mystical contemplation outlined above is the essence of all the spirituality of Hugh of Saint Victor. He gives it at the beginning of his homilies on Ecclesiastes as though he were stating principles. And what follows, is, in fact, the whole of moral theology or *Christian ascesis,* based on the underlying idea that the contempt of the world is the means of rising to that wisdom in which God is to be found. We have already indicated the large

[1] *Ibid.,* col. 118. — [2] *Ibid.*

[3] See the *Soliloquy* and *De autore Sponsi.* "Sponsus est Deus; sponsa est anima ", *Ibid.*

[4] Non semper domi est Sponsus iste, cavet enim forte ne vilescat amor suus; et quia citius in tædium veniret, si semper præsens esset, ideo aliquando se subtrahit,... ut dum requiratur absens, strictius teneatur præsens. *De autore Sp.,* beginning, col. 987.

[5] Cf. *Erud. didas.,* bk. v, 9. They are not "extraordinary" in the perfect. Though Hugh was not acquainted with this conception his context naturally rules it out.

[6] Contemplation affords a *vision of God* which according to Hugh is neither the knowledge of God by faith alone, nor the beatific vision, but a certain interior enlightenment which opens the eyes of the soul to the presence of God, says F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 264-265. — [7] *In Eccl.,* horn. 1, col. 118.

place he gives in his general moral teaching to abnegation, the virtues, and above all, charity, whose praises he so ardently sings: *O bona cantas! O bona cara caritas!*[1] A large use is also made of the understanding, a marked characteristic of the School of Saint Victor. Though not achieving the systematic forms[2] that were to be the glory of the Renascence ascetics, he stressed the need both of *meditation,* conceived as a simple exercise of devotion distinct from simple reading and prayer, and of *active contemplation (speculatio)* closely allied to purely mystical prayer but nevertheless distinct[3]. Hugh made a free use of symbolism, a method that was to be developed by his disciple and spiritual heir, Richard of Saint Victor[4].

II. RICHARD OF SAINT VICTOR.

A Scotsman by birth, Richard became a monk at Saint Victor at an unknown date, sub-prior of the abbey in 1159, and prior three years later. He was deeply pained by the disorder that reigned at that time in the monastery and did his best to accomplish a reform. He died about 1173 having acquired a great reputation for his learning and holiness.

His principal *theological work* is a treatise on the Trinity[5] in 6 books. At the outset of his first book he announces that he is solely occupied with the truths of faith and that he intends to make a much greater use of reason than of appeals to authority (ch. 4). He treats in order of the unity of nature (bk. I and II) and the plurality of persons (bk. III-V) employing a method that is reminiscent of that of St. Anselm and St. Augustine. He bases his explanation of the mystery especially on the attributes of love and goodness. This work, despite certain defects, was great enough for Laforet to consider it one of the most important theological speculations bequeathed by the Middle Ages.

1 *De laude caritatis,* col. 976.

3 He was content to state the principles and make judicious and occasionally subtle distinctions.

' To these exercises may be compared St. Bernard's *consideration,* which may have been inspired by them.

4 Sec below, p. 464.

5 *P. L.,* 196, 887-992.

In addition, Richard composed ten dogmatic opuscula[1] among which, one particularly deserving mention is the *De Verbo Incarnato** written in St. Anselm's manner to prove the necessity and meetness of the Incarnation of the Son.

Diverse and fairly important moral and ascetic treatises depend on his theology :

1. *De exterminatione mali et promotione boni* (3 treatises) 3;

2. *De statu interioris hominis* (3 treatises) 4. This treatise shows how man is afflicted with three wounds : powerlessness, ignorance, and concupiscence (bk. 1) whence three kinds of sins result : frailty, errors, deliberate evil-doing (bk. Il); for which there are three remedies : the commandments of God, promises, threats, (bk. III).

3. *De gradibus caritatis* (in 4 chapters) 5 and *De quatuor gradibus violentiez caritatis*: these two spiritual opuscula 7 are to be ranked among the finest eulogies of perfect charity; they treat the same subject with the same ardour and almost the same method. The *first* reveals the power *(insuperabilitas)* of divine love (c. 1) its insatiable eagerness (c. 2) its faculty for fixing the mind on its object (c. 3), and the heart (c. 4). The *second* classes the same qualities in a different order: it shows how divine love makes a captive of the whole man : the affection or desire of his mind (1st degree) that can never afterwards forget (2nd degree), and his very operation, which becomes suspended (3rd degree), and still this love remains insatiable (4th degree).

The *De eruditione interioris hominis** is a work of spirituality based on biblical symbolism in the manner of the treatises mentioned below which arc mystical rather than exegetical. It consists in an application of Nabuchodonosor's dream and Daniel's vision (Z>aw., Il, iv, Vil) to the interior life.

Some fifteen of Richard's writings have a biblical theme, but for the most part they are mystical rather than exegetical. The most famous in this class are the two *Benjamin* and the commentary of the Canticle.

[1] *P. L.*, 196, 991-1074. — [2] *P. L.*, *ibid.*, 995-1010 (15 chaps).
[3] *P. L.*, *ibid.*, 1073-1116. — [4] *P. L.*, *ibid.*, 1115-1160.
[5] *P. L.*, *ibid.*, 1195-1208. — [6] *P. L.*, *ibid.*, 1207-1224.
[7] They are distinguished by their title from four others : *De potestate ligandi el solvendi; De judiciaria potestate in finali judicio; De spiritu blasphemiu; De differentia peccati mortalis et venialis.* *P. L.*, 196, 1159-1194.
[8] *P. L.*, 196, 1229-1366 (3 books). There is extant some little correspondence (letters sent and received): *P. L.*, 196, 1225-1230.

Benjamin minor[1] whose subject is indicated by the subtitle *Liber de præparatione animi ad contemplationem* explains in 87 chapters the need of self purification and the acquisition of virtues in order to prepare for contemplation, which receives a preliminary treatment towards the end of the work.

In the Benjamin major[2] which treats *De gratia contemplationis,* Richard considers contemplation as the essential element of the state of perfection to which he supposes that all religious are called by the fact of their vocation.

The work contains 5 books. The *1st* is devoted to general explanations. To the simple *thought (cogitatio)* that passes, and *meditation* which studiously seeks for truth, it opposes *contemplation* which penetrates and considers this truth in wonder. Its *object,* or rather its *objects* (termed *spectacula sapientia)* are various. Richard indicates six of the principal ones and treats them in the 3 following books. *Book II* deals solely with the *lower creation.* Richard admires respectively *a)* their sensible beauty : 1st contemplation (ch. 1-6) the truth that reason brings to light in them: 2nd contemplation (ch. 7-11); *c)* the part of divine truth they represent or express : 3rd contemplation (ch. 12-27). *Book III* deals with the object of the 4th contemplation (the *soul,* envisaged both in the natural and the supernatural order; the soul enables us to acquire a knowledge of spiritual beings. *Book IV* considers the two higher contemplations (5th and 6th) whose object is properly transcendent: *God* Himself, known by faith, whether His *attributes* (they are "supra, non contra rationem") are considered, or the *Trinity* itself (which is—or seems to be—"contra rationem". The same book shows how the study of the soul itself is an aid to a better understanding of these transcendent realities. In the *Vth book* these diverse forms of contemplation are studied from another angle, that of their *cause* or principle and these are classed under three heads : some are *human* (the result of man's own forces), others *divino-human* or mixed (the work of divine enlightenment and man's own activity), the last *divine* (effect of the divine operation on the soul, placed, as it were, outside of itself): in the last (ch. 5-19) there result " excessus mentis ", produced by devotion, wonder and exultation.

The Commentary of the Canticle of Canticles[3] is obviously a symbolical interpretation of the inspired work, taking it to mean the union of Christ with the Church and souls.

Among the remaining exegetical works[4], similarly imbued with symbolism, should also be mentioned : vH

I. treatise on the *Vision of Ezechicl* (20 ch.) S;

[1] *P. L., ibid.,* 1-64. [2] *P. L., ibid.,* 63-202. — *P. L., ibid.,* 405-524 (42 chaps), 523-528, 665-684.

2. two books on the *Emmanuel;*
3. seven books on the *Apocalypse*

Like Hugh, Richard of Saint Victor was an outstanding theologian. His treatise on the Trinity is one of the most learned of the Middle Ages. His method like that of the Augustinians is both speculative and affective. He makes a free use of symbolism, and loves to seek God in His works. He proves the existence of God through the principle of causality. Psychology is fairly well developed in his work and implements both his moral and mystical teaching. Though he makes no explicit distinction between the three eyes of the soul *{oculus carnis,* to see the world, *oculus rationis,* to perceive oneself, *oculus contemplationis,* to see God) 3, as does Hugh, he attributes to the mind the knowledge of sensible bodies, the knowledge of their essences by the *ratio* and the knowledge of the immaterial (including the first moral and intellectual principles) by the intelligence *(intelligentia pura);* the mind is also able to know itself and by this means obtain a knowledge of God. In all its spiritual activity the reason is provided with an interior and divine light, whose nature is but vaguely defined 4. Richard makes no clear distinction between the natural and the supernatural order, but it cannot be said that he confuses them : his mystical method tends to unite instead of separating elements that of themselves are quite distinct.

Richard indeed was a mystic: the greatest theoretical teacher of mysticism in the Middle Ages. In this he differs from St. Bernard who was essentially practical. Not that Richard also failed to study the *ascesis;* he put his finger on human frailtes and indicated their remedies and the virtues that make possible the union with God 5, but his mind drew him on, as if in spite of himself, towards the summits, whether he sang the love of God, or discussed the qualities of contemplation. On this last subject his works provide an inexhaustible plenitude, somewhat tangled, always subtle, but nevertheless constituting an unrivalled source of information on medieval spirituality. Both St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas have retained, almost without change, the intellectual structures of Richard of St. Victor.

* *P. L., ibid.,* 601-666. —2 *P. L., ibid.,* 683-8S8. — 3 *De sacramentis,* I, p. X, 2.
4 M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. mid.,* 1, p. 64.
5 See chiefly *De statu interioris hominis* and *Benjamin minor.*

It is of primary import to understand exactly what he meant by the word contemplation which is so often met with in his work. He *defines it:* " Libera mentis perspicacia in sapienti® spectacula cum admiratione suspensa"12 He ascribes to it two qualities by which it "transcends" meditation: its facility for perceiving that which the latter still seeks, and the joy that derives from its wonder'. Though it should be observed that God is the object here in question, this definition nevertheless remains very *general.* It is made more precise by means of subtle and learned *classifications.* We will speak here mainly of two; one based on the immediate objects that fall within the consideration of the mind, the other on the principles or causes that give rise to contemplative knowledge.

The objective classification distinguishes 6 contemplations which may be reduced to three groups, indicated by the author himself:3 4 All contemplation is lost in admiration of God either in His works or in Himself. The first group contemplates the *creatures that ari inferior* to the soul and which in their own way reflect the divine perfections. The fourth contemplation which dwells on the *soul,* the image of God, is intermediary between the first and the third group. In this latter the two higher contemplations regard the *divine truth itself* such as it is revealed by faith; they can, however, be allied with profit to the foregoing *, since the spiritual image of God helps us to understand God Himself. This method of gradual elevation has much to be said for it and leads the mind without strain to a noble and pure idea of God.

But the recognition of its immediate object alone is not sufficient to characterise contemplation ; in addition, and with even greater care, it becomes necessary to observe the nature of the knowledge it provides together with its origin. Here again Richard distinguishes three classes of contemplation : one is human, another divino-human or mixed and the third divine. The first is termed *human* since it consists in a simple unfolding of the intellectual forces developed skilfully by exercise and concentration:5 it results in a true delight. The second is *divino-human* since it is the result of the divine outpouring into the human mind, which in its turn co-operates with grace which gives it wings and endows it with greater perspicacity in spiritual matters6. The third, lastly, is called *divine* because it is the exclusive effect of a powerful grace that seizes on the mind as though it were detached from itself, its usual activities being, as it were, suspended, under the influx of some superior activity that is characterised by an " excessus mentis " 7. These expressions may, with proper safeguards, find a place within the modern framework8. M

The truly specific element of contemplation taken in a strict sense as a divine operation, appears to be this " excessus mentis ", which

1 *Benjamin Maj.,* I, 4. Compare with Hugh's definitions, p. 448.

2 *Ibid.,* Proprium itaque est contemplationi jucunditatis suæ spectaculo cum admiratione inhaerere. ¿¿d,

' See *Benjamin major,* bk. n (cont. 1-3), bk. ni (cont. 4) bk. IV (cont. 5-6).

4 *Benjamin maj.,* bk. IV, c. 20 sq. — 5 *Ibid., v,* 3.—6 *Ibid., v,* 4. — 7 *Ibid.,* V, 5sq.

8 They correspond fairly accurately to what we have termed *imperfect* (1st.) and *perfect* (nnd) *contemplative meditation* or *contemplation in the proper sensi of the word* (lllrd). See vol. I, p. 22-28 and above p. 364. -JM

is proper to the third form, the essentials of which, however, are found in an attenuated degree in the 2nd[1]. The word is sometimes rendered by ecstasy, but for Richard it usually bears a wider meaning: it signifies all increase *(excessus)* of intellectual penetration accruing to the mind independently of its proper operation, especially by the affective way; notably by perfect charity, with or without ecstasy[3]. The cause of the "excessus" in general is in fact charity, considered either in its usual form of devotion *(prat magnitudine devotionis)* [3], or identified with the admiration that it produces, *(jrce magnitudine admirationis)* [4] or with the exultation it provokes *(pree magnitudine exultations)* [5]. Charity, source of the " excessus ", is itself properly the gift of the Holy Ghost and the sign of His particular presence in the soul[6]; charity is the grace that gives rise to "divine" contemplation and also that mixed contemplation in which the operation of God and man unite in a perfect work[7].

These principles applied to the various objects of contemplation enable us to see what kind of prayer is mystic according to Richard and what merely human. He establishes an important distinction between the first four and the two higher kinds. Considering them *in themselves* according to the nature of their objects the *first* are not simply natural if they are inspired by faith, but human (in the sense we have shewn) and common. They[8] are not mystical, since for the contemplation of their object charity is unnecessary. Quite other are the *two superior and divine objects:* Richard does not think they can be apprehended in a purely human contemplation :" They wholly depend on grace", he says[8], an explicit affirmation that at least states a principle even should exceptions be elsewhere implied [9]. The transcendency of the object explains why it is impossible to acquire, not some knowledge of it, but certainly a true contemplative knowledge, in the absence of a special grace : the latter is a result of charity[10], a grace that may intensify contemp-

[1] Primus surgit ex industria humana, tertius ex sola gratia divina, medius autem ex utriusque permixtione, humante videlicet industrie et gratiæ divinte. *Benj. ma;.* v, 2.

[3] Which explains why Richard finds it in every mode of contemplation. *Ibid.,* IV, 22.

[3] *Ibid., V,* 5-8. —[4] *Ibid.,* v, 9-13. —[5] *Ibid.,* v, 14-18. — [6] *De Trinitate,* vi, 14.

[7] Though the grace is substantially the same in these two forms of contemplation, it may be granted in varying degrees, so that in one case it tends to suspend human activity whilst in another it guides and perfects it.

[8] Sed in ultimis istis duabus, totum pendet ex gratia, et omnino longinqua sunt et valde remota ab omni humana industria, nisi in quantum unusquisque cælitus accipit et angelica: sibi similitudinis habitum divinitus perducit. *Benj. ma;.,* 1, 12.

[9] Omnia contemplationum genera possunt modo utroque fieri, et modo per mentis excessum, modo sine aliquo mentis excessu solent exerceri. *Ibid.,* iv, 22.

[10] See the two treatises analysed above, on charity, p. 451.

lation to the point of ecstasy in the true meaning of the word and even beyond [1].

There is no reason to suppose however that the *divine verities* may not form the direct object of a mixed contemplation [2]: the term "speculations" which is attributed even to the highest degrees, answers to this concept [3]. All Augustinian theology is inspired by this method *of* which Richard is an illustrious exponent. Moreover, even the *first four objects* can be contemplated in this manner by means *of* a divino-human activity. The fourth contemplation may be associated to the other two and as Richard says, their frequent practice is capable of leading to the most sublime favours[3]. In addition it is quite evident that even if the purely human forms of contemplation arc not mystical, they at least dispose the soul to contemplation in the true sense of the word.

All truly mystical grace *(excessus mentis)* transcends the powers of man and is vouchsafed by God alone [4]; it is nevertheless necessary and should we never experience it, the cause is to be found in our lack of love for Gods. Sometimes this grace is granted without preparation of the soul; at others it follows on earnest effort[6][7]and some souls acquire the habit of contemplation in so great a measure that they are able to exercise it at will [7]. Pious desires dispose the soul for the reception of the gift of God[8] and the contemplative must always hold himself ready for its comings. Occasionally it is withheld as a passing trial: subsequently to be restored in greater measure [10];* provided that the soul remains faithful, especially if it truly loves God, for the object of burning love cannot be hid [11]. Richard's insistence on the two essential elements of contemplation, the knowledge of God and His love, rank him among the foremost disciples of Saint Augustine in the Middle Ages. After his death the School of Saint Victor suffered a swift decline [12]

[1] It has been said that Richard attributed to contemplation the vision of the divine essence itself. This would not be easy to prove.

[3] *Ibid.,* bk. IV, 19-21. — [3] *Ibid., 21.* — [4] *Ibid.,* v, 15.

[5] *Ibid.,* V, 5. — [6] *Ibid.,* iv, 23.

[7] *Ibid.,* IV, 23. This statement should not be read without reference to the author's teaching as a whole.

[8] *Ibid.,* iv, 10 sq. —[9] *ibid.,* iv, 13. — [10] *De erud. horn. inf.,* c. 1, col. 1231.

[11] Amor enim vehemens, ut ait beatus Augustinus, non potest non videre quem amat, quia amor oculus est et amare videre est. *De gradibus caritatis,* c. 3, coi. 1203. If the mystical content of these texts is properly understood it is clear they imply no voluntarism.

[12] See the following chapter, p. 463. For the spirituality of the School of Saint Victor as a whole, see chap. XIv, p. 697.

CHAPTER VI

Peter Lombard. The Summists.

Special Bibliography (for Peter Lombard) *.

Editions : *P. L.*, 191-192. Recent critical edit, of the *Sententia* in *Opera S. Bonaventura,* bk. i-iv, Quaracchi, 1892 sq. Studies : F. PROLOIS, *P. Lombard, son époque, sa vie, ses écrits, son influence,* Paris, 1881. N. Espenberger, *Die philosophie des Petrus Lombardus,* Munster in W., 1901. M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der schol. Methode,* II, p. 359-407. J. DE Ghellinck, *Le mouvement théol. au* XIIe s., p. 126-169. Th. HEITZ, *Les rapports entre la phil. et la foi,* p. 42-48. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* II, col. 91-96.

I. — PETER LOMBARD (died 1160).

The influence exercised by Peter Lombard made of him one of the foremost theologians of the XIIth century. Scholastic theology, until then uncertain of its way, found in him a sure guide whose authority inspired the learned scholar no less than the humble student. The fame of Peter Lombard appears due entirely to his own efforts. Born of humble parents at Novara in Lombardy [2], he left Italy on completing his studies, stayed a short time at Reims, and came to Paris, where St. Bernard's introduction gained him a welcome at Saint Victor. Here he must have known Hugh. Perhaps he listened to Abelard's lectures; in any case he was acquainted with his works. Soon he himself was teaching theology at Notre Dame. He commented the *Psalms*[3], all the *Epistles of S. Paul*[4], and composed the famous *Books of Sentences* (finished about 1150). Some time previously, in the course of a visit to Rome, he had become acquainted with the work of St. John Damascene that had been recently translated. In 1159 he was named Bishop of Paris. In the following year another bishop ruled in the see; Peter must have died in the meantime. But his volume of theology was to make his authority felt for many centuries to come.

* For the other authors, see the notes.

[2] For his life, see J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.*, p. 126 sq.

[3] *P. L.*, 191, 61-1296. — [4] *P. L.*, 191, 1297-1696 and 192, 9 520.

The Books of Sentences are a true theological summa in 4 parts : *book I* treats, in 48 distinctions (or chapters) of the three divine Persons as well as of the knowledge and will of God; *book II* (in 44 dist.), speaks of the creation, angels, the hexaemeron, the fall and grace; *book III* (in 40 dist.), is concerned with the Incarnation, the virtues, sins and commandments; lastly *book IV* (in 50 dist.), deals with the sacraments, the sacramentáis and the last things. This division purports to be a development of the famous distinction established by St. Augustine between *res* and *signa;*[1] but the comparison is somewhat superficial and another author was able to set out an almost similar order of treatises based on the beginning of the *Quicumque*[2].

This work soon gained for its author an exceptional authority and earned for him the title of Master of Sentences or simply Master, *Magister.* One can hardly expect to find absolute perfection in such a work and modern critics complacently point out its shortcomings; it possesses neither the depth of Anselm's work nor the subtility of Abelard's nor the originality of Hugh of Saint Victor's[3]. It nevertheless contains excellent *didactic qualities* much appreciated by the ancients. Within its pages are to be found a complete doctrinal explanation of all that touches theology, a judicious choice of Patristic evidence providing an ample presentation *of* the argument from authority and serving to introduce dialectic arguments, principally as regards contemporary problems: the author was well abreast of the latter, and has something to say of each, without, however, claiming to solve them all. All these varied matters are briefly, clearly and methodically set out, in a definite order, free from digressions and verbosity. The tone of the work is *moderate.* Lombard certainly hits out against those who abused the use of dialectics and compromised theological learning with their babbling, as he termed it[4]. But neither did he despise the aid of reasoning and was even classed with Abelard by one violent polemist[5]. He was prudently reticent on the delicate question of the relation of faith and reason[6], a wise attitude at the period in question. Peter Lombard's principal aim was to remain *traditional* and *orthodox.* The favourable judgment that has always been passed on him by ecclesiastical authority and great teachers is proof that he succeeded. He has given rise to discussion on but a few less certain opinions[7].

Peter Lombard's method was well adapted to his purpose of providing a harmonious explanation of all the traditional doctrine. " Hence, the arguments from authority come in the first place ; next follows dialectics either in order to conciliate the texts or to pass judgment

1 *De doct. christ.,* I, 2-3.
2 The *Sententia* of Gandolf. Cf. J. DE Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 131.
3 See *ibid.,* p. 132 sq.
4 *Garruli ratiocinatores.* Preface. — 5 See Walter of St Victor, p. 453.
6 T. Heitz, *op. cit.,* p. 42-48. — 7 See below, p. 460.

on contemporary opinions or to slip in a somewhat more speculative note here and there. It is evident that some of the various matters discussed called for frequent appeals to reason, while for others the text of the Fathers sufficed " [1]. The subjects treated in the first three books were much more susceptible of discussion than those in the fourth book, in which the author relies mainly on quotations, save for one or two matters, such, for instance, the Eucharist. As a rule the philosophical adjuncts are sober enough and of no great depth. Lombard's philosophy was eclectic and he borrowed much from Abelard, Hugh of Saint Victor and Gratian [2]. He also made some little use of St. John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa* [3], which had just been translated into Latin [4].*

Both his method of composition and the nature of his work precluded Peter Lombard from achieving anything really original. He nevertheless exercised a great influence on the development of scholastic theology, for he shaped the minds of some of the greatest theologians of the Church and this is no little merit. The progress of doctrine in the strict sense owes much less to him, except in the question of the *sacraments* to which he gave its final form [5]. By his systematisation of his predecessor's teaching he marked an advance on three points: i) he made a more perfect application of the philosophical idea of cause to the sacraments; 2) he distinguished the two elements whose union produces the sacramental rite *(res et verba);* 3) lastly, and principally, he distinguished the true sacraments from mere symbols and classed them rationally to the number of seven. Here, of course, we have not " the formal creation " of a new dogma, as Harnack puts it, but merely an explicitation of traditional data [6].*

This work of Peter Lombard met with considerable opposition before it came into general favour in the schools". An outcry was raised against his method by certain narrow-minded mystics [8] who judged his method to be too speculative. Others reproached him with using one of Abelard's

[1] J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 137-138.

[2] Abelard's *Sic el Non* provided a great number of texts, as well as Hugh's *De sacramentis.* Gratian's *Decretum* is mainly used for the treatment of the sacraments. See J. de GHELLINCK, *op. cit.,* p. 140 sq. For the *Summa Sententiarum,* see below, p. 461.

[3] J. de Ghellinck lists 8 quotations in book I and about twenty in book III. *Op. cit.,* p. 240-241.

[4] About 1148-1150, by the lawyer Burgundio, of Pisa. Cf. J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 246 sq. — [5] see p. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 40, 60 sq., 247 sq.

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 246-251. — [7] j. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 150-169.

[8] Chiefly Walter of Saint-Victor, see p. 463.

expressions teaching *Christological nihilism* x, an expression which had in fact been proscribed by Alexander III in 1177[2]. Nevertheless it was in vain that an attempt to condemn his work was made at the third Lateran Council in 1179, while a second attempt in 1215 at the fourth Lateran Council 3 ended, on the contrary, with a solemn approbation of the author's book which was explicitly quoted, an event that is perhaps unique in the history of conciliary canons 4. From that time the authority of the Master of Sentences was no longer questioned. It was considered sufficient to point out the *opinions* he had formed and which were no longer taught 5. One of these, rejected by later theological teaching, was that which identified the *Holy Ghost* with charity, making of a divine person the formal cause of justification6.

II. THE SUMMISTS.

A) Anonymous Summae.

Numerous summae were composed in the course of the Xllth century or the beginning of the Xllith. The two that are most famous are anonymous, or at least of uncertain origin.

i. The Sententiæ divinitatis 7 were written between 1141 and 1148. They are the work of a disciple of Gilbert de la Porree8, whose more characteristic utterances are quoted almost to the letter. They were condemned in the Council of Reims (1148)9, especially as regards their Trinitarian and Christological teaching ,0. The whole of theology is treated systematically in this work and divided into 6 treatises: *De. creatione mundi; De creatione primi hominis et de libero arbitrio; De peccato originali; De sacramento incarnationis; De sacramentis*

1 *An Christus secundum homo sit persona vel aliquid.* See above, p. 419.

Alexander III, before he became pope, had himself used this expression in his famous *Sententia.* See below, p. 409. umB

3 I he chief opposers were Gerhoch of Reichenberg and Walter of Saint Victor, the author of the *Liber de vera et falsa philosophia* in which the Trinitarian doctrine is disputed, and also Joachim of Flora. See J. DE Ghell INCK, *op. cit.,* p. 154-163. — 4 */bid.,* p. 163.

5 St. Bonaventure mentions eight. Others have added to these.

6 Doctrine already rejected by St. Bonaventure *{/n Sent.,* iv, bk. I, dist. XVII, art. I, q. I), and St. Thomas *{Sum. theol.,* II»-IIæ, q. 23, a. 2).

' Edited by B. Geyer, *Die Sententia divinitatis,* Münster, 1909. M. Grab· MANN, *Op. Cit.,* II, p. 437-438.

For the existence of a Gilbertine faction, see F. Vernet, *Gilbert de la P,* m *Did. théol.*, col. 1054-1055.

« See above, p. 415. — 50 B. Geyer, *op. cit.,* p I0.->8

and lastly, *De divinitate et trinitate.* The unknown author drew his inspiration from William of Champeaux and Anselm of Laon, as well as from Gilbert de la Porrée *.

2. The Summa Sententiarum 2 like the preceding work, comprises six treatises, of which three are devoted to the sacraments: I. the theological virtues, the Trinity and the Incarnation; 2. the angels, their creation, their state; 3. man, his creation, fall and present state; 4. the sacraments in general; 5. baptism; 6. four other sacraments, necessary for all: confirmation, the Eucharist, penance and extreme unction. Holy Orders are mentioned in passing (tr. VI, 15), but as the work was never finished it may be supposed that the author would have treated this sacrament at greater length. The treatise on marriage with which the volume now ends is a later addition, borrowed from Walter of Mortagne. The identity of the *author* of this valuable work has given rise to a great deal of discussion.

In various manuscripts of the xnth century it passes as a work of Hugh of St. Victor and for a long period this was thought to be beyond doubt3. In recent years however, this has been questioned4 cither because of the silence of very many manuscripts or because of the method used, which resembles Abelard's rather than Hugh's. It may of course be retorted that the master of Saint Victor after having followed St. Anselm in the *De sacramentis,* benefited by Abelard's useful innovations in a new work5. Yet in addition to the chronological obstacles, certain doctrinal differences between the *Summa* and the *De Sacramentis* make it hardly probable, if not impossible6 for Hugh to have composed the former writing. On the other hand the indications found in some manuscripts and the silence of others may be explained if the author was one of Hugh's disciples, perhaps a certain Otho 7. But should this be so, another question arises: was the *Summa Sententiarum* written before or after Lombard's *Libri Sententiarum!* That one depends on the other is witnessed by their many doctrinal

' See above, p. 415.

2 *L.,* 170, 31-174. G. Robert, *Les écoles...,* p. 212-237. See also, *Rev. August.,* 1908 (t. XU), p. 529-560.

3 Again maintained by some modern critics with some divergences; P. Fournier, E. Kaiser, Ostler, B. Hauréau, Mignon, Vernet, Grabmann.

4 First by Denifle (In *Arch. Litt. it. Kireheng. Mitt.,* HI, 1887, p. 634), Portalié *{Abélard,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 52-54).

5 The anteriority of the *Summa* over the *De sacramentis* is admitted by P. Fournier and others. For the contrary thesis, see G. Robert, *op. cit.,* p. 221-234.

6 As Fr. Portalié thought, *op. cit.* See in the contrary sense, the article quoted from the *Revue Augustinienne.*

' According to a xnth century manuscript bearing the title: *Sententia magistri Ottonis ex dictis magistri /Ligonis.* This isolated witness, however, has but a relative worth.

and verbal similarities. Until recent times it has appeared certain that Lombard's work depended on the *Summa* *, with the consequent determination of the latter's composition before 1150. A recent author has attempted to prove that the *Summa Sententiarum* was *written by Hugh of Montagne about 1155** and thus posterior to that of Peter Lombard. But this thesis fails to explain many difficulties2 and the mystery *of* the origin of the *Summa* is not vet solved.

B) Authors of Summae.

Very many were the authors of theological treatises who drew their inspiration to a greater or lesser extent from the great works we have mentioned, from that of St. Anselm to that of Peter Lombard.

1. Gandulf of Bologna 4 (xnth cent., after 1150), was the author of a collection of theological *Sententice*5 long considered to be Peter Lombard's sources, but which in reality probably depend on his work; the author summarises Lombard and uses his ideas6.7 He was widely read in the xnth century.

2. Peter of Poitiers 7 (d. 1205) was one of the first to commentate Peter Lombard. He is considered to be one of his greatest disciples and to him is mainly due the wide diffusion of the master's work. He was a professor at Paris and also chancellor of the University. He wrote five books of Sentences and especially Glosses on those of Lombard: *Glossa stiper sententias.* They throw interesting light on the theological method in vogue at the end of the Xllth century. Together with his master, Peter was attacked by the opponents of dialectics.

3. A certain Maitre Martin, professor at Paris about 1200 also composed *Qucestiones tjteologice,* not to be confused with the *Summa* of his contemporary Martin de Fugeriis 8.

' " Faithful to the customs of his time Peter Lombard did not hesitate to draw largely on the *Summa,* to such an extent that a recent author thought that these borrowings justified him in ascribing this work to Lombard himself". J. DE Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 121.

2 M. Chossat, S. J., Paris-Louvain, 1923. Preface and Introduction by J. de Ghellinck.

3 A catalogue of *1*151 containing the *Summa.* Cf. *Rev. nlo-scol.,* May 1928, p. 242-245.

4 J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 178-244. M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 388-391.

5 Denifle, *Abaelerds Sentenzen und die Bearbeitungen seiner Théologie·,* in *Arch, fur Litt,* etc., 1885, vol. i. Gandulf's *Sententia* were recently edited by J. de Walter, Vienne, 1924. 3·

6 J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 223. fl

7 M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 501-524.

8 *Ibid.,* p. 524-531· 3

Robert of Melun1 (d. 1167), though he has fallen into obscurity since the Xllth century, was a more striking figure. An Englishman by birth he came for his studies to Paris, where he also taught, before opening his own school at Melun. Among his famous disciples were John of Salisbury, John of Cornwall and Thomas Becket. He was named Bishop of Hereford in 1163 and died shortly afterwards. He has left three theological works2, one moral *{Qucestiones de divina patina}* and the others dogmatic, in the form of a commentary *(Qucestiones de Epistolis Pauli)* and a methodical treatise *{Sententia).* He was a disciple both of Hugh of Saint Victor and of Abelard and makes a very moderate use of their theological methods: authority and speculation. He quotes Peter Lombard but also criticises him. At the Synod of Reims (1148) he was against Gilbert de la Porrée. He was nevertheless a fairly independent thinker and his work deserves closer study3. We will do no more here than mention Grabmann's observation that Robert, like Saint Augustine and Saint Anselm, stresses the intellectual nature of faith: faith supposes a certain understanding (of words), but also, of itself, in this life, acquires a real understanding of truth, though this remains inferior to that which will be given in the next world4.

Other summists will be mentioned in their place at the beginning of the XIIIth century5.

III. DIVERSE AUTHORS.

A) Adversaries and defenders of dialectics.

The use of the scholastic method in theology did not receive an equally warm welcome in every quarter. Towards the end of the century the Abbey of Saint Victor became the focus of a tenacious and even violent opposition against the dialecticians. The best known protagonist of this movement was the prior, Walter of St. Victor6, who, about 1180, wrote a pamphlet entitled *Contra quatuor*

1 M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 323-358. R. Martin, *Eauvrc thiol, de R. de M.,* in *Rev. Hist, eccl.,* 1920 (vol. ix), p. 456-999; *Pro Abelardo,* in *Rev. Sc. phil.-thiol.,* 1923 (vol. xn), p. 308-333 ; *Les idles de R. de ‹ÌL sur leplchi originel, ibid.,* 1913 (vu), p. 700-725; 1919 (vin), p. 439-466; 1920 (ix), p. 103-120; 1922 (xi), p. 390-415.

2 Unedited except for parts published by Denifle, du Boulay, Grabmann.

3 See R. Martin's articles on original sin (see note 1).

4 M. Grabmann, *op. at.,* p. 338. In this place the author deals mainly with the *Sentences* and gives many unpublished texts.

5 See p. 483. From this list of authors must be omitted Hildebert of Lavardin to whom was wrongly ascribed the *Tractatus theologicus,* now attributed by Hauréau *(Notices,* v, 251) to Hugh of St. Victor, and the *Philosophia moralis* of William of Conches. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 145. 146 and 195, n. 2.

6 J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 158-160. M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 124-127.

Labyrinthos Francia' i. e., against Abelard, Peter Lombard, Gilbert de la Porree and Peter of Poitiers. Not only was the hot-headed polemist unguarded in his accusations but also indiscriminate in those he aimed at; St.John Damascene, for instance. His information was often inexact. He termed dialectics an impious and devilish art. Walter who died about 11 So, found a worthy successor in ABSALOM of Saint Victor (d. 1203) a canon regular of his monastery[1].

Opposition was also rife in other circles. The monasteries of *Cîleauv* and *Fonte-Avellana* were active centres of unrest, while the secular clergy also raised their voices in criticism. Stephen of Tournai (d. 1203) in a letter to the pope, denounced the introduction of dialectics in all the Parisian faculties, even that of Canon Law[3]. Peter OF Blois (d. 1200) found it absurd that the Trinity and the mysteries were everywhere made a subject of discussion, and foresaw the fate of Icarus for these rash and imprudent logicians[4]. Michael OF CORBEIL (1199; Archbishop of Sens, declared philosophy to be useless, in his commentary of the Psalms[5].

The reasons for this prejudice were various. Saint Bernard's attacks on Abelard and Gilbert and his hard sayings were due to his love of *orthodoxy*[6]. The same may be said of his friend William of St. Thierry[7]. For many adversaries *of* dialectics at the end of the century this solicitude was aggravated at times, and especially at Saini Victor, by the excesses of an exaggerated *mysticism*. Nevertheless, it would seem that the main cause of the opposition was due to the undoubted exaggerations of the dialecticians[8] who were discrediting logic by their hair-splitting and "Gualidic" reasoning[9]. Such methods of disputation were applied to everything and theology was bound to suffer from them.

John of Salisbury[10] (cl. 1180) brilliantly undertook the defense of reason, for the greater glory of the faith, in that masterpiece, the *Metalogicus.* An Englishman by birth, John was trained at Chartres and Paris at the school of the great masters, and became secretary to two Archbishops

1 Unpublished. Abstract by Denifle; extracts in various authors.

3 M. GRABMANN, *ibid.,* p. 127. —3 *Ibid.,* ii, p. 121-122.

4 *Ibid.,* p. 120-121. —5 *Inutilis inquisitio studium philosophia. Ibid.,* p. 127.

6 *Ibid.,* p. 104-108. See above, p. 431. H

7 William of Saint Thierry (died about 1148) a native of Liege, Benedictine abbot of St. Thierry, near Reims, later a Cistercian at Signy and a friend of St. Bernard was also vigilant in his orthodoxy and drew the latter's attention to several errors. The greater part of his work is ascetic. *P. L.,* 180, 184.

8 M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* 11, p. in-117.

9 From the name of their inventor, De Gualon. For instance: Thou has what thou has not lost; but thou has not lost horns; therefore thou hast horns.

,0 M. Demimuid, */. de Salisbury,* Paris, 1873 (biog.). C. SCHAARSCHMIDT, *J. Saresberiensis nach Leben und Studien...,* Leipsic, 1862. M. DE WULF, *op. at.,* ii, p. 166-170. J. Baudot, *fean de S.,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 808-816.

of Canterbury, Thibaut and then Thomas Becket whose exile he shared and whose murder he witnessed. John himself became Archbishop of Chartres in 1176 and died in this see. He was an accomplished humanist and wrote, in addition to many letters (339 preserved), and the lives of St. Anselm and St. Thomas Becket, a great treatise on political and social morality *(Polycraticus)* and especially a defence of logic together with a syllabus of relevant studies in the *Metalogicus* [1]. With ruthless irony, in a parody of Cornificius, he scoffed at the enemies of learning who disparaged all intellectual culture, and the pseudo-philosophers with their quibbling and hair-splitting. He was firmly convinced of the immense value of dialectics; yet he did not regard it as able to stand alone, separated from other branches of learning. He was faithful to Augustine's conception of the relation between faith and reason. His entire work and cast of thought show him to have been a philosopher rather than a theologian [2].

B) Controversialists and moralists.

The literary interests of Alain de Lilies (d. 1202) place him in the same class as John of Salisbury, but his work as a whole reveals him as a theologian. Born at Lille about 1120, he was a professor at Paris and Montpellier, became later a Cistercian and as such combated the Albigenses and died at Cîteaux in 1202. Alain was a talented poet and writer, as well as an accomplished dialectician and vigorous polemist.

His chief work is a treatise in 4 books Contra hæreticos[4], i. e., the Cathari (bk. I), the Waldenses (bk. 11) the Jews (bk. in) and the Mahommedans (bk. iv). In his Prologue he shows that faith is based not only on "divine reasons" but also on "human reasons" and goes on to combine in his work both the argument from authority and rational speculation. His method is wholly scholastic: opponents' objections, true doctrine, solution of difficulties.

1 Edit. J. A. Giles, Oxford, 1848, 5 vols., reproduced in *P. L.*, 1 : *Polycraticus,* col. 379-823 ; *Mctalogicus,* col. 823-945 : etc.

3 He has been charged with teaching tyrannicide, but he allowed the killing of tyrants only in the name of public authority *{Polyc.,* HI, c. Xv), which wrests the power from the individual as such and thus regularises the situation. He teaches the direct power of the pope over the temporal power of kings *(Polyc.,* IV, c. i-111), which is exaggerated.

3 See M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* n, p. 452-476. M. Jacquin, *Alain de L.,* in *Diet. Hist.,* col. 1299-1304. Works in *P. L.,* 210.

4 *P. L.,* 210, 303-430.

Alain left many other writings, notably two essays on general theology, one in the form of *Theological Maxims*[1] (125, treating of God, 1-62; of morality 63-115; *of* causes 116-125), anfl the other, a *Theological Dictionary*[2]. He also wrote, in addition to many sermons (a dozen are published), a little treatise on preaching[3], a very pious commentary on the *Canticle* applied to the Virgin Mary[4], a treatise on the dispositions required in the true penitent, *De sex alis Cherubim*[5]. In a fine poem in which he rewrites Claudian's *In Rufinum* in a contrary sense (hence the title *Anticlaudianus*[6]) he shows how "nature allies itself with the virtues, to drive out vice and form the perfect man"[7]. Though Alain was not a very deep or original thinker, he was a skilful representative of the traditional theology inspired by St. Augustine; and the pleasant style in which he wrapped his teaching is as precious as it is rare.

Peter de Blois[9] (d. 1200) was also a controversialist, famous not only for his prejudices against the dialecticians but also for his book *Contra perfidiam judæorum*[10] which elegantly and firmly demonstrates the scriptural proofs of the messianic character of Christ to the Jews. He was born of Breton parentage at Blois, educated at Paris and Bologna where he acquired a deep culture. lie carried out various ecclesiastical missions to the courts of England, France and Sicily and also Rome; he refused preferment and died an archdeacon at London in 1200.

In addition to the polemical work mentioned above he left a considerable number of writings[11]: letters (243), sermons (65), diverse treatises (on friendship, the advantage of troubles, Job, bad bishops, training of bishops, confession, penance, etc.). There is even found among his works an instruction on the faith, to the Sultan of Iconium who was toying with the idea of conversion. Peter de Blois wielded great influence over his contemporaries; some indeed, looked on him as a new Father of the Church.

1 *Maxima theologica,* or *Regula de sacra theologia* or *Regula calestis juris; P. L.,* 210, 617-684.

2 *Distinctiones dictionum theologicarum ; P. L.,* 210, 685-1012.

3 *P. L., ibid.,* 109-198 (containing but 3 of the five parts answering the questions: *Quid? Quis? Quibus? Cut? Ubi?)* — 4 *P. L., ibid.,* 51-110.

5 *Ibid.,* 265-280 (wrongly attributed to St. Bonaventure).

6 *Ibid.,* 4S1-576. Same subject in the *De planctu natura, ibid.,* 429-482, a mixture of prose and verse. Various other poems, *ibid.,* and elsewhere.

7 M. Jacquin, *op. cit.,* col. 1299. See *ibid.,* 1302 sq., on the question of a canonial work by Alain, and other unpublished and apocryphal works. I he *Ars catholica fidei* (/-*. *I..,* 210, 593-618) long ascribed to Alain, appears to be the work of Nicholas of Reims according to the manuscripts. Cf. M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* it, p. 459-465; 471-476 (where the author exposes Nicholas theological method, which he calls mathematico-deductive).

8 For his philosophy, see M. de Wulf, *op. cit* n n 175-178

9 Hurter, *Nomenci. lilt.,* vol. 11, col. 168-170'

w *P. L.,* 207, 825-872. — » *P. L.,* 207.

William Prévostin (d. about 1210) chancellor of Paris after 1206 composed a *Summa contra hcereticos*[1] containing information about the Passagians.

At this time also, two other doctors had their meed *of* fame, Petrus Cantor (d. 1197) and Petrus Comestor (d. 1178 or 1198) who, laying aside speculation, preferred to give a more practical turn to theology. The former wrote a moral Summa[2] and various other moral and exegetical treatises. The latter *{Comestor,* in the sense of bookworm) composed a vast historical scriptural compilation[3] translated into several European languages[4]. Several others of the period showed the same tendencies[5].

C) Theology and Canon Law[6].

A final characteristic of medieval theology, especially noticeable in the xnth century, was its close connection with canon law both as regards method and to some extent, subject matter. Their common ground was mainly" the *sacraments,* the theology of which was making rapid progress at the time, and *ecclesiology,* brought to the forefront by the struggle that had been waging between the clergy and the empire from the time of Gregory VII. This connection is especially evident in the great collections we are about to mention.

"The traces of a dogmatic teaching "[7] are to be found but incidentally in the collection of Burchard of Worms (d. 1023)[8]. In the *Decree* of Yves de Chartres (d. 1117)[9], on the other hand, theology occupies an important place; dealing with the sacraments lie borrows mainly from the dogmatic sources of the Fathers for he was obliged to take into account controversies similar to that of Berengarius ; influenced

1 G. Lacombe, *La vie et les œuvres de Prévostin,* Kain, 1927. Prévostin or Præpositînus of Cremona (?) left a number of unpublished works, even a *Summa theologica,* in addition to the *Summa contra hardicos,* aimed chiefly at the Passagians, sectaries who had their own interpretation of the Old Testament. Cf. *Rev. sc. phil. théol.,* 1927, p. 308-317; 1928, p. 286-288.

R- 2O5' 23*37° (Annotated by G. Galopin). Cf. Feret, *op. cit.,* i, p. 58-68. M. Grabmann, *op. cit.,* π, p. 476-485. Hurter, *op. cit.,* n, 164-167.

3/<Z., 198, 1053-1722 (Sermons, 1722-1844). Hurter, *op. at.,* 11, 1S3-185. Cf. Feret, *op. cit.,* 1, 42-48.

' " In those days no writer on Holy Writ was greater or more esteemed than Peter Comestor " Richard Simon. ' *Hist. crii, du N. T.,* 11, p. 320.

5 See M. Grabmann, *ibid.,* p. 485 sq.

6 J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 277-346; *Gratien,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 1731-1751· —7 J· de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 285; see *ibid.,* p. 283-287.

6 P. Fournier, *Le Décret de B. de IV.,* in *Rev. Hist, eccl.,* 1911 (vol. xu), p. 451-473, 670-701.

9 J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 297-303. P. Fournier, *Les collections can. attribuées à Yves de Chartres,* in *Bibi. Ecole de Chartres,* 1896 (vol. LVII) and 1897 (vol. 1 v iii), 3 articles. See also *Rev. quest, hist.,* 1898 (vol. 1 x iii), p. 51-98, 384-405·

by the Italian collections he emphasises the treatise on the Roman Primacy when studying the Church.

Gratian[2] is better known, not for his life (all that is known is that he was professor at Bologna in the middle of the XIII century) but for his famous collection, the *Decreel* Its nature is well indicated by the title[4] *Concordia discordantium canonum.* The work, unlike the foregoing, is not merely a simple collection of texts, but a "treatise of canonical science". Having cited his "authorities", the author briefly gives *(dicta Gratiani)* the solution of the difficulties to which they give rise; a method patently inspired by Abelard's *Sic et Non* which was widely read at Bologna. The work is divided into distinctions and causes. In the 1st Part the DISTINCTIONS number 101, dealing with the law in general (D. I-XX) and the clergy (D. XXI-CI). In the IInd Part there are 7 on penance *(de pcenit.)s* and 5 on the rites *(de consecratione)* in the Hird Part. The CAUSES, of which there are 36, subdivided into *questions*^, are found exclusively in the IInd Part; they deal with judgments. This work was probably composed about 1140[7]. Though never an official document, the Decree acquired immense authority in the Church; it was so much the *Corpus juris* that official documents remained *Extra-vagantes.* Though mainly of a juridical character this work also possessed a moral and even dogmatic tenor that should not be overlooked[8].

Orlando Bandinelli, Pope Alexander III[9] (1159-1181), should rightly claim our attention at the close of this

[2] Especially that *Of the LXXIV titles* (unedited) composed about 1050, before Gregory λ II, in which the traditional rights of the Holy See are properly stressed. See P. Fournier, *Mèi. Arch, et Hist.,* 1S94 (xiv), p. 147-223. J. de Ghei.i.inck, *op. cit.,* 289-292.

[3] A. Vilien, *Graden* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 1727-1731. A. Van Hove, *Commentâtinni Imánense. Prolegomena,* 1928, p. 160-167.

[3] Innumerable editions. Excellent critical edit., E. Friedberg, Leipsic, 1879.

[4] Also called, *Decreta, Liber canonum, Corpus decretorum, Corpusjuris.*

[5] They form the 3rd question of the XXXHird cause.

[6] The 3rd q. of the xxxiurd cause is alone divided into distinctions.

[7] After 1139, date of the nnd Lateran Council whose acts are quoted; before II51, the date of Lombard's Sentences which make use of the Decree. See especially P. Fournier, *Deux controverses sur les origines du Décret de Graden,* in *Rev. hist. liti, telig.,* 1898 (ill), p. 97-116; 253-280.

[8] See J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 306-310.

[9] I°KlALlE' *l^ppnd)e III,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 711-714; H. MOUREAU, *ibid.,* col. 717-721. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 11, 162-164.

chapter. Before he became cardinal (115°) he was a professor of theology at Bologna and wrote two *Summæ,* 30th very valuable for the religious history of his times. The first is a summary of the Decree, entitled *Stroma l,* which he completed about 1148 and which makes of him one of the first known "decretists"[2] Unfortunately he treats only of the IInd Part. The other Summa, known as *Sententice*[3] was discovered quite recently and is even of greater importance for the history of theology, for Orlando follows the method of the Parisian master and thus bears witness to his influence. He even borrowed certain dangerous expressions, especially on the Incarnation, but these he retracted at a later dateL As a rule however, he corrects Abelard's teaching with a masterly touch and is not slow to condemn. As *pope,* he remained in close touch with the intellectual movement, in spite of his many occupations. In 1177 he refused to condemn P. Lombard, while reproving the errors that divided scholars at that time[5]; he introduced disciplinary measures of great doctrinal import concerning the form of baptism and the marriage bond[6]. But his intervention in these matters was but the prelude to that of his great successor Innocent III at the beginning of the following century.

[8] Discovered by Maassen: edited by Tiianer, *Die Summa Magistri Rolandi Bandinelli,* Innsbriick, 1874.

[3] On the Decretists see A. Van Hove, *op. cit.,* p. 221-230. Orlando's Sumina was preceded only by the juridical Summa of Paucapalea (written between 1145 and 1148).

[3] Discovered by Denitie, edited by A. GlETL, *Die Sentenzen Rolands,* Freiburg im B., 1891 (introduction and commentary).

[4] *Epist.* to William Archb. of Reims, 1177. Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion,* n. 393. See above, p. 460.

[5] E. Portalie, *Adoptianisme,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 416-417.

[6] Denzinger-B., *Ench.,* n. 395-399.

CHAPTER VII.

Theology at the beginning of the XIIIth century.

I. THEOLOGY AND THE UNIVERSITIES.

The founding of the Universities was the great theological event of the XIIIth century[1]. The special schools, which, in the XIIth century, attracted young men by the teaching of a famous master or by their cultivation of some particular branch of learning, gave place to associations of various schools, masters, and pupils: *Universitas magistrorum et scolarium,* At Paris, about 1200, they are found grouped in four Faculties[2]: theology, art and philosophy, law, and medicine. At the beginning of the century the University of Paris was recognised as a corporate body by Philip Augustus[3] and in 1215 received its charter in the statutes which the pope sent with the legate Robert of Courçon[4]. Other universities were rapidly founded in other countries[5] and modelled on Paris, though the)' never transcended nor equalled her fame[6]. The popes kept a close watch on these great intellectual centres and endeavoured to maintain the place of honour for the study of theology. With this intention they facilitated the introduction of the Dominicans and Franciscans into the University. After 1230 the teaching of the monks was particularly successful.

1 M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode,* II (1911), p. 9-13. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 237 sq.

2 The fame of the teaching methods introduced through Abelard's influence contributed considerably to the success of the Parisian schools in the XIIth century, while those of Bologna were retained for law. See G. Robert, *op. cit.,* p. 179sq.

3 Denifle-Chatelain, *Chartularium Univ. Parisiensis,* I, 1889, p. 59-61.

4 *Ibid.,* p. 78-79.

5 At the same time as *Paris,* the law school of *Bologna* also attained the status of a university (beginning of the XIIIth cent.). Other "studia generalia" were shortly afterwards created at *Padua* (1222), *Naples* (1224); in France at *Toulouse* (1229); in England at *Oxford* (about 1240). *Cambridge* did not properly become a university before the end of the century. In Spain in the XIIIth century are found *Salamanca, Seville,* etc. Cf. M. de WULF, *op. cit.,* I, p. 246; II, p. 151.

6 M. Grabmann, *Die Anfänge des Dominikanischen Studienwesens,* in *Hist. Jahrbuch,* 1927, p. 228-258. P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'averroïsme latin au XIIIe siècle,* 2e éd., 1911, p. XLI-LIII. H. Denifle, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400,* I, 1885. H. Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages,* 2 vol., 1895. A. Clerval, *Les écoles de Chartres au moyen âge du Ve au XVIe siècle,* 1895. P. Mandonnet, *Siger de B.,* p. XLI.

Theology always held first place in the University of Paris in the Middle Ages. The "arts" of course were more necessary from one point of view, inasmuch as they were required as a qualification for the other faculties. The members of the Faculties of Arts were in the majority and also the most turbulent. After a century and a half of agitation they succeeded in obtaining their own rector. But this numerical and administrative advantage cannot hide the fact that the arts were merely a stage leading to the superior courses and degrees[1], notably theology, which held first place. Philosophy which crowns the arts is but the servant of theology': *Philosophia ancilla theologice, Theologia regina scientiarum*[2]. And it is a fact that it was the theologians who made the greatest use of philosophy' and provided us with the best sources as regards contemporary' philosophical teachings.

The degrees in theology were the same as for the other branches of learning, but several characteristics that were proper to them should be mentioned here[4][5] The degree of Bachelor comprised several grades: the first consisted in the reading or explanation of the Bible in the literal sense *(baccalarius biblicus),* but this degree was no more than a preparation: the real bachelor "read", the *Sententice* Lombard *{baccalarius sententiarius).* By means of this exercise the student became a complete bachelor *(baccalarius formatus)* and after several public disputations, rounded off by a formal examination, he received his *licence* from the Chancellor of the University. " He was allowed to exercise officially the functions which, until then, he had performed as an apprentice". The degree of Master or incorporation in a group of masters was conferred by the exercise of functions that were mainly honorary; the masters explained the Scriptures from a doctrinal viewpoints.

Two methods were usually employed in teaching: lessons *(lectio)* and discussion *(disputatio).*

The lectio[6] has given us the great scholastic commentaries on the Books of Sentences and the Scriptures. There is nothing more rigid

1 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, 238. —2 See J. de Ghellinck, *op. cit.,* p. 67-70.

3 Paris nevertheless knew' philosophers who were not theologians. Siger of Brabant, for instance, and Boethius of Dacia, as Mandonnet observes, *op. cit.,* p. XLIIj "but with this one reservation" adds the author "it is true that the doctrinal life of the Faculty of Theology was far superior to that of the other faculties ".

4 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 239-241. Cf. *Chartularium,* 1, 530-532 and passim.

5 See an article by Denifle on this subject, *Quel livre servait de base à l'enseignement des maîtres en théologie,* in *Rev. thom.,* 1894, p. 149-161.

6 On the *lectio* in the XIIth century see G. Robert, *op. cit.,* p. 52-56.

than the procedure employed in these works. We may instance St. Bonaventure's manner [1]* of explaining a " Distinction " from Lombard. He treats in order the text and the doctrine. First the whole *text* is read; it is then analysed, and, as it were, dissected; finally the difficulties to which it gives rise are proposed and immediately solved. Only then is the *doctrine* discussed, by spreading it over a group of articles (or, exceptionally, parts which are subdivided into articles); each article provides a number of questions or problems needing solution ; the author gives his reasons in favour of the solution he adopts, and then the contrary arguments: in his conclusion he takes a definite view and completes his explanation by replying to the objections already made. St. Thomas with minor differences proceeds in the same way; his method is perhaps the more sober. The text being read, he rapidly divides the subject into questions; each question is divided into articles which focus the teaching on each point in the following manner: first, objections are made, together with some contrary argument; a general solution is then given followed by the answer to the objections. The objections of the articles are occasionally brought together in the form of little questions *(quastiunculce),* to each of which a solution is given at the end of the article·.

The disputatio appears to have been adopted in the teaching of theology about 1230-1240. It "consists of two phases: first an interchange takes place between one or several objectors *(opponens)* and a respondent *(rcsPondcns)* other than the one who is charged with the final defence. When the discussion is well advanced, the master intervenes and later in the session (Pelster) or on another day (Mandonnet), he sums up methodically every question raised, classes the opinions and arguments, summarises the objections and the answers, meets certain difficulties that his respondent has deliberately left unsolved and finishes by giving a final solution or *determinatio,* introduced by the words: "*respondeo dicendum quod"* or a similar formula"[3]. Such was the method employed in both types of *disputatio.* for there were two main types[4]: the *disputationes ordinaria,* in which the master himself, when he thought it necessary, proposed and solved the technical problems arising out of his teaching; and the *disputationes generates,* extraordinary and solemn, in which the auditors put all kinds of theological and other *(de quolibet)* objections to the master[5]. These were usually held at Easter and Christmas[6] and attracted many listeners in addition to the students[7]. Of even greater solemnity were the discussions that took place between the masters *disputationes magistrales.* In these especially, representatives of rival schools and doctrinal tendencies entered the lists. The literary records of these

[1] See below, p. 502.

[a] This threefold processus (1. exposition for and against, 2. solution, 3. answer), which carries on the tradition of the Xilth century, is a logical outcome of the Aristotelian teaching of ἀπορια " says M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 246.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 242-243. — [4] *ibid.,* p. 242.

[5] In his answers however, the master did his best to group under one head even the most disparate questions.

[6] Hence the name sometimes given them : *de natali, de pascha.*

[*l*] St. Thomas seems to have introduced this kind of discussion

discussions have come down to us in the form of *Qucestiones (quest, disputatcc, queest. de quolibet,* etc.), or *Reportationes,* i. e., short-hand notes made by an auditor for some master [1].

The theological literature of the Middle Ages thus began to take on a more marked "scholastic character" and reached its zenith in the xmth century. The great *commentaries* are the consequence of the " lessons " given by the masters; the *qucestiones* result from their "discussions". The *summæ* also derive from this teaching or were at least a pendant to it, though some, such as the *Summa contra gentiles,* were an exception. Some analogous writings dealing *ex professo* with a theological or philosophical question did not originate in the atmosphere of the schools : these were the *treatises* [2] or *pamphlets* [3]. To these may also be added *sermons* and *lectures,* for St. Bonaventure, though not engaged in teaching, often wrote in this manner on philosophical questions [4], treating them, it may be said, more as a theologian than as a philosopher. But though the majority of theological works of the Middle Ages are marked by the didactic method of the schools, their scholastic character is due even in greater measure to the large place that philosophy finds in them.

II.—THEOLOGY AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT IN THE XHIth CENTURY.

A) The philosophy of the Augustinians.

The resistance to the adoption of the speculative method in theology [5] during the Xilth century seems to have finally broken down in the xmth, when the greatest works of this kind first appeared. Beyond doubt the master in theology was then Saint Augustine : thus, those theologians who preceded St. Thomas and were inspired by the Bishop of Hippo may be termed Augustinians. All subscribed to the great theological doctrines that characterised Augustinism, and in varying degrees but none the less truly, reflected his influence in their religious speculations. Like him they

1 These were called *Lectura, Reportata, Reportatio* to distinguish them from the *Expositio* or course drawn up entirely by the master.

3 Saint Anselm's monographs were made in this mould and are veritable masterpieces.

3 For instance, in the controversy on the Mendicants, after 1254.

4 Sec below, p. 501. — 5 See above, pp. 368, 432, 463, sq.

sought to formulate a very pure but fairly complex[1] idea of God and it is this that gives to their theology its theoretical and practical character and calls for a speculative and affective method. Like Augustine, they found God in symbolsand were lifted up to Him by the way of degrees. From Augustine they learnt to respect Plato and accept his teaching[2]. Hence, this Christian Platonism has sometimes been called Augustinism.

Augustinism taken as signifying a *doctrinal body* must be understood mainly of the *greatest theological doctrines* as has been said[3]. There is, of course, a philosophical Augustinism, but this should not be unduly stressed, for Augustine was not primarily a philosopher but used philosophy in the service of Christian thought. Furthermore, all the philosophical systems of his remote disciples in the Middle Ages should not be laid to his charge. Under the pressure of many circumstances, philosophical speculation knew a great development in the XIIth and XHIth centuries, and in very-different directions. It would be neither prudent nor even possible to classify these results in one body of doctrine; and what is more, this "doctrinal body" even were it constituted, could only be called Augustinism "with explicit reservations", as M. de Wulf observes[4].

The uncertain character of what has been called the philosophical Augustinism of the Middle Ages is evident from the fact that the Augustinians of the Middle Ages were far from agreeing on many important philosophical data. It has been observed that they were not even in harmony on the radical question of the *origin of ideas*[5]: no doubt they all explain it by means of a divine enlightenment, but this expression hides many very different meanings: innatism, ontologism, illuminism, special intellectual cooperation or merely an ordinary co-operation, according to the Thomist expression which its defenders claim to derive from Augustine. Yet it would seem that not one of these formularies exactly expresses all the shades of Augustine's thought: his system, if he had one, was rather *intuitionism,* or doctrine of the intuition of ideas, with a mystical tendency: he was content to observe the existence of intuitively perceived primary ideas in the mind, to which he ascribed capital importance in both the natural and the supernatural order[6].

[1] See the *Introduction* to Book IV, p. 356, sq.
[2] Or at least Neoplatonism. See vol. 1, p. 640, sq.
[3] See the *Introduction* to Book IV, p. 356.
[4] *Hist, de la phil. méd.,* I, p. 320, see *ibid.,* p. 318-321.
[5] See E. PORTALIÉ, *Augustin (saint),* in *Diet. ib¿o¡* col. 2334-2U7 and *iM* col. 2509-25.4. E. Gilson, *La ,M/às.* ¿ [illegible], p. 346 sty — [6] See above, p. 358.

As for the other points of doctrine, many were the *additions* that were made to his teaching for the sake of exactness : the Augustinians as a whole, it is said, admit the identity of the soul and its *faculties;* yet the distinction is made very clearly by Hugh of St. Victor and much less rigidly by St. Bonaventure', who was perhaps closer to Augustine than the others. Hugh and Bonaventure also distinguish the *two intellects**, *of* which there is no explicit teaching in .Augustine. The latter hasarded the hypothesis of *seminal reasons*2, but the applications made by his disciples would have astonished him. The *plurality of joints* that was based on them, points to a Jewish or Arab influence4*like the doctrine *of spiritual matter,* inspired by Avicebrons. The Aristotelian theory of *act* and *power* was also widespread in the Middle Ages. As for the identification of being and Z/«7z/, we may be allowed to doubt that it had for Augustine the same uphysical" meaning that was given it by some Xlllth century writers6.

These instances, and there are many others, prove how ambiguous is the expression " Augustinism", as applied to any medieval philosophy. The term itself, moreover, is of fairly recent invention7. Its only advantage is to indicate a group of tendencies opposed to the new star of Thomism 8, but the same purpose may be served by confining the term Augustinism to the theological signification we have mentioned9 thus avoiding the drawbacks of the other.

The Neoplatonism of the medieval Augustinians was extremely eclectic. Though it derived in a large measure from St. Augustine it was also subject to other influences and especially the Arabians whose speculation was similarly eclectic but included a very great admixture of Neoplatonist doctrines, such as emanation and the return to God through ecstasy, and others of less importance. Several of these doctrines were certainly anti-Christian, others might possibly be considered consonant with the faith. When Arabian literature became known in the West, especially in the

1 See below, p. 512, 523. — 2 See below, p. 513. — 3 See vol. 1, p. 676.

4 Avicebron's theory. See below, p. 478. St. Thomas ascribes it to the Arabs and not to St. Augustine. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 10.

5 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 320. Cf. E. Gilson, *Phil, de S. Bonaventure,* p. 229 sq. St. Augustine's *quasi-materia* had a considerably different signification to that given it by the Middle Ages, thinks M. de Wulf.

6 See E. Gilson, *Introd, à Pitude de S. Augustin,* Paris, 1929, p. 106 sq.

7 Due mainly to a little study published by Fr. Ehrle in 1889, *^er Augustinisntus u. Aristotelisinus in d. Scholastik gegen Ende der XII[f.,* in *Archiv. f. Litt.,* etc. 1889 (vol. V), p. 603-635.

8 "St. .Augustine became the patron of a philosophical and theological faction only at an advanced date, especially after the appearance of Thomism. The appellation of Augustinism had thus chiefly a controversial sense, justifiable only about the year 1270 ". M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* p. 320-321.

9 The Augustinians defended their theological conceptions, which they wrongly thought to be ruined by Thomism, much more than they did their philosophy. See below, p. 576.

XIIth century, it brought to the theologians, mainly through Avicenna's writings, many new Neo platonist elements*. Nevertheless the effect of this influx on Western thought cannot be compared with the introduction of a great part of Aristotle's work into Europe by the Arabians in the XIIIth century.

B) Arabian Aristotelianism.

The Arabians had a great esteem for Aristotle whom they regarded as the greatest of philosophers. They took from him "the idea of knowledge, the value of the observation of facts and a multitude of particular doctrines in which the scholastics were to take them as mentors. But it would be a mistake to think that Arabian philosophy was a faithful echo *of the* Peripatetics. Apart from the fact that the Arabians used defective Aristotelian texts..., they read their own ideas into the Greek commentaries *of* Aristotle; they changed the teaching by forcing a signification on passages that are vague in the philosopher's own writings, particularly those that regard the human intellect. Especially did they add to their Aristotelianism a number *of* Neoplatonist elements, such as the theories *of* emanation and ecstasy"[1].

They thus achieved a very specific philosophical syncretism. According to M. de Wulf "three theories gave to their explanation of reality a distinctive character: they regard the emanation of spheres, the human intellect and matter. *Emanation,* clearly explained in the *Theology of Aristotle*[3], establishes a link between the supreme Being and the Intelligences4... These Intelligences are extrinsically united to the celestial spheres (stellar or planetary) and are the cause of their local movement... The *human Intellect* is the last and the most imperfect *of* pure intelligences5;... it is impersonal, not proper to human individuals, but to all humankind..., it is the last degree of the Intelligences and acts as motive principle for the revolutions of the Moon. *Matter* is eternal (Greek philosophy). Those who make of it an emanation from the supreme Principle are patently pantheists (Avicebron), but the best philosophers hold the existence of a matter distinct from God and co eternal (Avicenna, Averroes)"[6]

1 See E. Gilson, *Pourquoi S. Thomas a critiqué S. Augustin?* Paris, 1927. The author stresses the influence of Avicenna on the Augustinians of the Middle Ages and thus explains St. Thomas' creation of a new and non-Platonist system.

3 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1. p. 208.

3 A compilation from Plotinus' *Enneads* (bk. iv, v, vi) made in the inrd or tv cent., translated into Arabic before 840 and attributed to the Stagirite. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* I, p. 208. Same teaching in the *Liber de causis,* which is an extract from the work of Produs.

4 Emanation by intermediaries, says Avicenna ; direct emanation, says Averroes.

5 Development of " an obscure text of Aristotle where it is said that the active intellect is a divine principle coming from without, (θὺραθεν) and which alone is immortal, whilst the passive understanding is born with the organism and dies with it". M. de Wulf, *ibid.,* p. 209.

6 M. de Wulf, *ibid.,* p. 208-209.

As was to be expected the Arabian philosophy first developed in the East thanks to the translations made from the Greek under the patronage of the Abbassides of Baghdad. The leading philosopher of this school was Avicenna (980-1037) *[Ibn Sino]*[1]. As forerunners he had *Alkendi* (d. about 870) who was mainly an encyclopaedist, *Alfarabi* (d. about 950), a great scholar and original thinker, and two famous sects, the *Motazilites* or dissidents, partisans of a rationalist philosophy, and the *Brothers of Purity,* a kind of Mussulman free-masonry to whom is due an encyclopaedia of 51 treatises. The *teaching of Avicenna* is mainly contained in a voluminous philosophical work in 18 volumes entitled "Al Schefa" (Healing) but it is said that he wrote more than a hundred books. According to Avicenna, the first intelligence, that of Saturn, emanates from God ; from this derives the intelligence of Jupiter etc., down to the active intellect that moves our world and our race. Since matter is eternal, God is not a creator but a giver of forms *(dator formarum).* The active intellect, a single separate form, enlightens the individual (passive) understanding which in the course of its development passes through five stages: material intelligence (pure possibility) : possible intellect (the intelligence endowed with the first principles); the intellect in act (capable of acquiring other knowledge); the perfected intellect (having acquired knowledge ; the blessed intelligence or mind (endowed with higher intuitions)[3]. In the XIth century the Mussulman theologians known as *Motacallimin* provoked a lively reaction against these bold speculations. *Al-Gazali* (1058-1111) was the leading spirit of this movement. Philosophy thus lost ground in Arabia but blossomed again in Spain.

Among the Western Arabian philosophers[3], the most famous was Averroes *(Ibn Boschd)*[4] (1126-1198) of Cordoba, doctor and scholar, an impassioned admirer of Aristotle[5] whom he commented and adapted. Since he held the theory of direct emanation, he conceived eternal matter not as pure non-being, but as a receptacle of active forces gradually released by the prime mover. The *human intelligence,* that which rules our planet and is the smallest of the planetary intelligences, " is an eternal immaterial form, distinct from individuals and single in number. This intelligence is both an *active* intellect and a material or *possible* intellect. Human reason is wholly impersonal and objective; it is the torch that enlightens individual souls and ensures the immutable participation of the eternal truths for the human race"[6]. It follows that the intelligence contracts merely a gradual accidental union with individuals, proportionate to the capabilities of each one[7]. According to this theory there is no place left for human conscience; the individual soul is destructible, but

* Carra de Vaux, *Avicenne,* Paris, 1900.

3 This higher knowledge and the theories that concern it may be termed "mystical ' in the sense indicated above (see p. 350). Here Avicenna was undoubtedly influenced by Neoplatonism or even Christianity.

3 *Avempace (Ibn Badja)* d. 1138, *Ibn Tofaïl,* d. 11S5 may also be cited.

4 M. Horten, *Die Metaphysik des Averroes,* Halle, 1912. Renan, *Averroes et I'averroisme,* Paris, 1867 (3rd ed.).

5 For which reason he was called *Commentator* in the Middle Ages.

6 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 215.

" Similar theory to that of Avicenna.

"humanity remains immortal in the eternity of objective reason"[1]. Arabian speculation rapidly declined after the disappearance of Averroes.

Jewish philosophy, both in the East and the West was influenced bv Arabian speculation. Of the Oriental writers the best known are *Isaac Israeli* (d. 955) and *Saadia* (d. 942), and in Spain, *Avicebron (Ibn Gabirol)* [2] (about 1020-1058) and Maimonidés (1135-1204). AVICEBRON [3] is noteworthy for two original theories : the plurality of matter and form in the same individual, and the combination of matter and form in spiritual substances. Maimonides[4], author of the *Guide of the Perplexed*[5], a veritable summa *of* Jewish scholasticism, entered much more intimately into Aristotle's ideas than did the other authors we have mentioned. He used biblical teaching as a corrective to the Peripatetic theories and was widely read by the Jews *of* Provence and even bv Christian Scholastics.

Such were channels by which Aristotle became known to the Latin West at the beginning of the xmth century. The Arabian works and those of the Stagirite were mainly translated at Toledo at the end of this century by Christian scholars at the archbishop's instigation. But this newly revealed Peripatetic teaching was of dubious value. Aristotle's writings[6] were often poorly rendered and sometimes completed by texts from Neoplatonic commentators. Purely Neoplatonic works were also ascribed to him [7]. In addition, the Arabian commentaries, translated at the same period, contained an interpretation of the texts that made them unacceptable to the Church. GuNDlSALVI *(Gundissalinus)* in the XHth century was able, even in the Arabian atmosphere of Toledo, to piece together an eclectic Aristotelianism spiced with Platonism, yet purged of all traces of Monism, thanks to the influence of Boethius and St. Augustine[8]. The danger however, remained, and was bound to provoke a reaction.

The explosion took place in Paris, where a provincial council in 1210 forbade under pain of excommunication the private or public teaching of "Aristotle's natural philosophy" (i. e., the *Physics* and probably the *Metaphysics')* and the commentaries [9] (those of Avicenna and Averroes). In 1215

[1] M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 216.

[2] Whom the Scholastics also call *Avicebrol* Avencebron, Avincembron etc.,

[3] Cf. Munck, *Melanges.de phil. juive et arabe,* Paris, 1859.

[4] L. G. Levy, *Maimonide,* Paris, 1911.

[5] Wrongly called *Guide ofthe Lost.*

[6] Especially his *Physics.*

[7] *Theologia Aristotelis,* and *Liber de causis:* cf above p 476

[8] M. DE Wulf, *op at.,* 1 p. 312. See p. 3I2.3,4 this aulhor who a philosopher rather than a theologian.

[9] *Charttil. Univ. parti* I, p. 70.

another explicit condemnation of the same books [1] was extended to the flagrantly heretical writings of David of Dinant and Amaury of Benes [2] and also a certain Maurice of Spain (perhaps Averroes) [3]. The inclusion of these latter works proves that the motive of their condemnation was their danger to the faith. For various reasons the popes did not require the application of the decrees [4] and in 1231, Gregory IX adopting a fresh standpoint, interested himself in the expurgation of Aristotle's work [5]. The commission that was appointed for this purpose [6] was unable to complete its task, but the idea remained [7]. Saint Albert the Great worked at the scientific side while St. Thomas carried out the task in a masterly fashion in the philosophical domain. This enormous work resulted in an adaptation of Peripatetic teaching to the Christian faith; it was first needful, however, to unearth the true Greek Aristotle from among the Arabian commentaries.

The dangers of the Arabian influence became only too obvious when a Latin Averroism " began to take root in Paris about 1255 where it found ardent supporters. The leader of this party, about 1270, was SIGER OF Brabant [9] a canon *of* Liège and a professor at the Faculty of Arts. The central teaching of the system [10] was Monopsychism which affirms that there is but a single intelligence for the whole *of* the human race; the individual soul is entirely sensible and destructible ; the soul of the race alone is immortal and enters merely into an accidental union with individuals. These adventurous theories which seriously compromised the faith by destroying human personality and opening the way to Pantheism, were vigorously combated by the Catholic doctors, Albert the Great and Saint Thomas. In addition they were explicitly condemned by the Church. The first act of suppression was the decree (Dec. 10, 1270), in which Stephen Tempier, Bishop of Paris, condemned thirteen Averroist propositions ". Other measures were taken

1 *Ibid.*, p. 78.

2 See below, p. 480.

3 Mandonnet's hypothesis : *Mauritius hyspanus* signifies *Maurus Hysfiania.*

4 Only current in Paris. Extended to Toulouse in 1243. The decrees were renewed in 1263 on account of the Parisian Averroism.

5 *Chartul. Univ. par.,* i, p. 138, 143.

6 *William ofAuxerre, Simon ofAuthie* and *Stephen oj Provins.*

7 Actually all Aristotle, even the condemned portions, was being taught at Paris about 1255 with the popes' connivance.

8 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 90-105.

9 P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant,* Freiburg, 1899 (2nd ed. Louvain, 190S-1911). The other protagonists of Averroism were *Boethius ofDacia* and *Bernier de Nivelles.* M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 100.

10 The Averroists admitted *lioo hinds of truth :* what is true in philosophy can be false in theology and reciprocally.

" *Chart. Univ, fiar.,* 1, p. 486.

in the course of the following years, but the best known is that of March 7th, 1277, by which Tempier again condemned Averroism together with other errors and opinions, numbering 219 propositions in all [1]. It should be observed that not only was the Archbishop's intervention somewhat precipitate[2] but it also aimed at a heterogenous body *cf* doctrine which extended in some part to the Peripatetic teaching, including that of St. Thomas[3]. The fortunes of Averroism began gradually to wane, though it was never entirely effaced. It never formed an independent heretical sect [4][5]

C) Various errors.

The xmth century theologians were called upon to defend the faith against other errors; first, Pantheism which seemed to hold an irresistible attraction *for* the disciples of the School of Chartres, if not for the masters themselves. As was mentioned above, *Bernard of Tours,* author *of* a treatise on the universe and a defender of Emanationism finally ended by professing Pantheism[6]. Amâ URï DE BENES [6] (d. 1207) brought up in the neighbourhood of Chartres taught at Paris " both in dialectics and theology... a substantialist Pantheism" : God is immanent in all things; the formal principle of all. Such teaching was bound to have an effect on morality and religion, and a sect, the *Amauricians,* was formed for the purpose of propagating it. It was refuted in an anonymous treatise[7] in 1208-1210 and the pope proscribed Amaury's treaching at Paris[8]. The Pantheism of David OF DINANT[9][10] was even grosser : he identified God with primary matter [10].

Manichaean or Albigensian Catharism brought into Europe a metaphysical and moral dualism radically incompatible with Christianity. Since these errors were anti-social they were suppressed by the civil power as may be seen in general and ecclesiastical historical works. Some of these errors were condemned by the IVth Lateran Council (1215) [11].

Certain heterodox forms of medieval mysticism may also be mentioned. They were marked by their Pantheistic tendencies. We shall deal with them below

Mbid.,p. 543.

- Anticipating that of John xxi who was then conducting an enquiry regarding the doctrinal position *of* the University. Mandonnet, *op. cit.,* p. CCXXVIH sq.

3 See below, p. 633. >9

4 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 104.

5 Also called Bernard Sylvester or Bernard of Chartres. See above, p. 414.

6 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 181-182.

7 *Contra Amaurianos;* Edit. Baeumker, 1893. This auther attributes it to the Cistercian, Garnier de Rochefort, Bishop of Langres (d. 1215).

8 See above, p. 478-479. ./9

9 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* i, p. 182-184. G. Théry, *David de Dinani,* in *¿Mélanges thomistes,* 1923, p. 361-408.

10 Stultissime posuit Deum esse materiam primam. *Sum. theol.,* I, q. m, a. S.

» Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion,* n. 428-430. On the Cathari, see E. Broeckx, *Le catharisme,* Louvain, 1916.

12 See ch. XIV, p. 692

III. PRINCIPAL SECULAR THEOLOGIANS.

William of Auvergne [1] (d. 1249) was undoubtedly the foremost representative of secular theologians in the first half of the XIII century. He was born at Aurillac about 1190, became professor of theology at Paris and bishop of that town in 1228. He occupied the see for more than twenty years. During this period his busy life did not Drevent him from completing the scholarly tasks he had Degun while he was teaching. He left to posterity a vast and noteworthy theological work dealing with nearly all the matters of a theological *Summa.*

It contains some thirty monographs. Several of these were incorporated in a kind of Christian encyclopaedia entitled *Magisterium divinale* composed between 1223 and 1240, " one of the most voluminous literary monuments bequeathed by scholasticism ", remarks Vernet. It deals with God, the universe (material and spiritual), the soul, the true religion *{de fide et legibus),* the sacraments, morality *(Summa de virtutibus et moribus).* Twenty other treatises [2] deal with the most varied subjects, such as the art of prayer, in the *De rhetorica divina,* or pulpit eloquence in the *De faciebus mundi* (or the science of similes, allegories, and symbols, by which spiritual realities can be expressed). The *De immortalitate animes,* taken almost literally from Gundissalinus also deserves mention.

Го judge by the number of authors he quotes or cites without acknowledgment (such as Maimonides) William was extremely well and widely [3] read. He was acquainted with all the currents of contemporary Christian thought, Aristotelianism, Platonism, Arabian philosophy. But he remained primarily an orthodox theologian and " wholly taken up by what was practical and necessary in his own time, he combated the reigning heresy of Catharism and the dangerous theories of the Arabian philosophy and its monopoly of Aristotle " [4]. Though he admired Aristotle

[1] Editions : Paris, 1591 ; Orleans, 1674, 2 vols in f., called Le Ferron's edit. Studies: N. Valois, *Guillaumed'Auvergne,* Paris, 1880. M. Baumgartner, *Die Erkenntnislehre des IV. von A.,* Munster, 1893. T. Heitz, *Rapports entre la philos, et la foi,* Paris, p. 99-105. M. DE WüLF, *Hist. phil. mid..* L P· 333'32^. F. Vernet, *Guillaume d'Auv.,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1967-1976, I. Kramp, *Des Wilhelm von A. Magisterium divinale,* in *Gregorianum,* 1920-1921. Ziesche, *Die Sakramentenlehre des IV. von A,,* 1911.

[2] Several have not been published. CL Vernet, *op. cit., igóS-iqóg.* Add about 530 sermons (Latin).

[3] *Ibid.,* col. 1970-:971. — [4] *Ibid.,* col. 1974.

and used him as much as he did Plato, he refuted his teaching on many points. He also had the perspicacity to combat astrology [1] and superstitions of all kinds that were rife in his time[2].

His proofs of the existence of God. are drawn from St. Augustine, early scholasticism and even the Arabians. "From the being which exists by participation *(ens per participationem)* he deduces lhe being which exists of itself *(ensper essentiam);* not by an application of the principle of causality, but because of the parallelism of lhe two concepts"[3]. He regards God as *Being,* pure existence, and thus sharply distinguished from creatures whose existence is limited and distinct from their essence[4]. He also conceives God as the eternal truth, the exemplar of all things, "whose light gives meaning to the truth of contingent essences".

In his theory of intellectual comprehension, William follows and completes St. Augustine. He rejected the active intellect as useless[5], since he thought that the intelligence finds the intelligible form with in itself, coincident with the sensible image. He likewise rejected the theory of a separate intelligence [6], and the real distinction of the soul and its faculties, which emphasises the simplicity of the soul without however lessening its activity[7]. On the other hand "he underlined the value of the immediate evidence of the object of consciousness (Augustine), for the direct object of the consciousness is not only the existence of the soul, but its essential properties, its immateriality, simplicity and indivisibility. Further, consciousness lays bare a category of rational knowledge : the primary principles"[8]. Since these principles possess a value independent of the existence of contingent beings, William concluded that the intelligence sees them directly in God, by means of a special enlightenment[9]. *J.

As a doctor, William of Auvergne nevertheless remains an interesting personality. Gifted with a vigorous mind, he was faithful to traditional methods but ready to welcome and adopt new theories when they appeared worthwhile.

1 The best minds of the time manifested a certain sympathy for lhe astrologers. William refuted their subversive theories on free will and providence. He nevertheless admitted that the stars influenced some material objects, sue'; as the sap of vegetation and the tides which obey the moon.

2 In his *De universo* he scoffs at alchemy, magic, fairy tales, were-wolws, will-o-the wisps etc., as things unworthy of *scientes* and *rationales.*

3 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* i, p. 324.

4 Avicenna's theory adopted by William of A., before St. Thomas, who made an even better use of it by linking it with the theory of act and power. William, it is true, said that God is the formal existence of all things, but without any Pantheistic intention. Cf. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 1972. He was thinking of efficient causality.

5 Vanissima est positio intellectus agentis. *De anima,* VII, 3,

6 Arabian teaching, which he thought to be Aristotle's*.

7 *De anima,* Hl, 6. — 8 M. DE Wui.F, *op. cit.,* 1 p. 327

9 *De anima,* vii, 6. Equivocal and insufficient formulary

His teaching may be regarded as a *prudent eclecticism,* in spite of a number of obsolete opinions. It is not to be compared however with the depth and solidity of St. Thomas' powerful synthesis.

Less outstanding is William of Auxerre', (d. 1231) Archdeacon of Beauvais, a Parisian theologian who, in 1231, was charged by Gregory IX to expurgate Aristotle's works in order to make them fit for teaching without danger to the faith *(ne utile per inutile vitietur)* ·. He wrote a Summa *(Summa aurea)*3 in the form of a commentary of Lombard's Sentences, which was very popular in the xnith century. Both his methods and his tendencies reveal the partisan of the Augustinian school and he makes a greater use of Augustine than of Aristotle 4.

Other theologians, having the same tendencies and likewise authors of *Summae* were as follows5.

1. Robert of Courçon6 (d. 1218), Englishman, professor at Paris, and cardinal in 1211.

2. Simon of Tournai7 (d. about 1219), a master at Paris; according to Grabmann, one of the first authors of dissertations on the " quodlibets

3. Stephen Langton8 (d. 1228), Englishman, professor of theology at Paris, chancellor and finally Archbishop of Canterbury, left various works.

4. Peter of Capua, professor at Paris, Patriarch of Antioch in 1219.

5. Philip of Grève9 (d. 1236) Chancellor of Paris about 1218, particularly emphasised the goodness of God in his *Summa de bono.*

6. Robert Sorbon 10 (d. 1274) "doctor devotus", chaplain of St. Louis wrote glosses on the Scriptures and various treatises on moral theology, but is chiefly famous for the college that perpetuates his name and which was originally founded for the education of poor students in theology.

The doctrinal authority of the popes in the xinth century was highly efficacious. By means of the depth and stability of their teaching they were able to guide and restrain in safe channels the intellectual ebullition of the period. Not only

' Denifle-Chatelain, *Chart. Univ, par.,* 1, p. 132-146, etc. T. Heitz, *op. at.,* p. 9298. J· Strake, *Die schol. Methode in d. Summa aurea,* in *Theol. u. Giaube,* 1913, p. 549-557. Hurter, Nomenclat., n, 264.

9 *Char. Univ, par.,* I, p. 143.

3 Edit. 1500, Paris, Later edit., Régnault, Paris, not so good.

4 He used Aristotle's Metaphysics and the commentary of Averroes in a commentary of Alain de l'Islc's *Anticlaudianus.*

5 For each of these see M. Grabmann, *Geschichte des sch. Methode,* 11, 2nd part, ch. Vii and VIII.

6 Hurter, col. 222-223. See above, p. 470.

7 *Ibid.,* col. 223. — 8 *Ibid.,* 269-271. — ? *Ibid.,* 272-273.

10 *Ibid.,* 342. Feret, *op. cit.,* 11, 203-213. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 251.

were they quick to condemn *error* but also devoted themselves to furthering *true learning* by aiding theological teaching in the universities and protecting the new religious orders (Franciscans and Dominicans) who were destined to be the most zealous sowers of the new methods. They have bequeathed to us innumerable *decretal* letters, concerning discipline for the most part, though many which deal with the sacraments possess an important dogmatic content. From all these standpoints the work of Innocent III (1198-1216) the most famous pope in the Middle ages, is immensely valuable. It consists mainly of *letters*^ but there are also several *treatises* (De contemptu mundi, Dialogus inter Deum et peccatorem, De eleemosyna, etc.' and nearly 80 *sermons* or outlines2. HONORIUS III (1216·1227) also left a number of treatises in addition to his decretal letters3 4. The influence of Gregory IX* (1227·1241), the nephew of Innocent III, appears to have been even more efficacious. In addition to providing for the composition of the Decretal collections he encouraged the Franciscans and Dominicans in their theological studies and gave them his support in the University of Paris. He also commissioned the expurgation of Aristotle's work in the same university 5. The same ends were pursued by their successors; sometimes, however, by widely differing paths. All these Xlllth century popes stand at the summit of the pontifical power. A vigorous witness of this is to be found in the letters of BONIFACE VIII67(1294-1303) who brings to an end this great medieval century?.

' Hurter, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 243-245. E. Amann. *Innocent III,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1961-1981. Bibliography.

' *P. L.,* 214-217. These volumes are the last in the collection. Migne's Latin work ends with these writings of the great pope on the threshold of the xmth century. The letters fill vols. 2x4-216. See DenzINGER-B. *End. Symb.,* n. 404-427 the doctrinal extracts and the decrees of the ivth I^ateran Council (1215), n. 428 sq. 5,

3 Hurter, *op. cit.,* 293-296.

4 *Ibid.,* 296-297.

5 See above, p. 479.

6 Hurter, *op. cit.,* 507-510. ^ I

7 See ch. XIII, p. 676.

CHAPTER VIII.

The first theologians of the Mendicant Orders.

Special Bibliography: (For the whole chapter).

Douais, *Essai sur Porganisation des études dans POrdre des Frères Prêcheurs,* Paris, 1884. H. Denifle, *Quelten zur Gelehrtengeschichte des Predigerordens in 13 u. 14. /.,* in *Arch, fur Lilt. u. Gesch.,* 11, 165 sq. P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant, Introd.,* ch. II; *De Pincorporation des Dominicains dans Pane. Université de Paris,* in *Rev. thom.,* 1896 (vol. IV), p. 133-170; *La crise scolaire au début du XIIF s. et la fond, de l'O. des Frères Prêcheurs (La théol. dans PO. des)* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 863-874. R. MARTIN, *Quelques "Premiers" maîtres dominicains,* in *Rev. scienc. phil. théol.,* 1920 (vol. ix), p. 556-580.

P. DE MartignÉ, *La scolastique et les trad, franciscaines,* Paris, 1888. Evangéliste de Saint-Béat, S. *François et la science,* Paris, 1895. H. Felder, *Geschichte...* Freiburg, 1904; trans, by Eusèbe de Bar-le-Duc, *Histoire des études dans PO. de S. François,* Paris, 1908. Edouard d'Alençon, *Frères Mineurs,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 828-830 and 862. E. Gilson, *La philosophie de S. Bonaventure,* p. 46-69.

I. THEOLOGY IN THE MENDICANT ORDERS.

The foundation of the Mendicant Orders in the XHIth century was an event of primary importance, not only from a spiritual and moral standpoint, but also in the doctrinal domain; for it was in their midst that the Church was to find its most illustrious theologians. The Dominican Order was particularly destined to use its influence in this sphere. Study was prescribed in its constitutions, and from the very first it "set up as a vast academic institution"[1]. Each house of the Order formed a *studium* in which a master gave lessons to the monks and the secular clerks who wished to attend them ; in the heart of each province was found a *studium solemne* and in several great centres, Paris (1229), Oxford, Cologne, Montpellier, Bologna (all 1248) a *studium generate,* attached to the University. At the outset only theology and Holy Scripture were taught. Since the liberal arts were forbidden to religious and as many of the latter

[1] P. Maxdonnet, *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 865.

had not studied philosophy before entering the monastery, their theological studies were considerably retarded or reduced. These hindrances were gradually overcome. The study of philosophy was first allowed in exceptional cases', and before long the exception became the rule. After the middle of the Ninth century, schools of arts were founded in the provinces. "The Preaching Friars owed to this move a predominating philosophical culture among their contemporaries and trained the leading philosophers of the time, Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas"[2]. They obtained a chair at the University of Paris in 1229 and another, two years later, in 1231. Their efforts to obtain a footing in the University always had the support of Rome.

In the Franciscan Order the growth of studies met with greater obstacles at the beginning. They· found no favour with St. Francis. He did not despise learning as such but had no wish to see it flourish in his Order. It seemed to him to be useless and dangerous. Nevertheless, while he still lived, the marvellous extension of the Order and its invasion by a very great number of clergy (the founder's first companions were nearly all laymen) together with the authority of the Roman Curia as represented by Cardinal Ugolino, the future Gregory IX, led to the official organisation of studies[3]. The clerks were generally agreed on this subject[4]. though some still protested against the abuse of learning and the pride to which it gave birth. In favour of learning was alleged "the need of an education that would enable them to preach otherwise than did the heretical sects: or that it was incumbent on the Franciscans not to be inferior to the Dominicans who boasted of their learning; or, on the other hand, the need for the two orders to make a common front against the ignorant sects who begged the alms due to the true religious without having the power to preach or say mass in return. All these combined influences brought forth the learned Order that Saint Francis had not desired"[5], and which was to give

1 *Constitutions* of 122S. —2 P. Mandonet, *ibid.,* 807.

3 It is possible that he himself allowed St. Anthony of Padua to teach theology at Bologna, though there are good motives for doubting the authenticity of the written text of this permission.

4 Brother Elie, successor to Francis and a simple layman, encouraged the clerks to study, but also wished to give responsible positions in the Order to laymen. — 5 E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 51-52.

to the Church one of its most eminent doctors in the person of St. Bonaventure. The first great study houses of the Order were Bologna where St. Anthony of Padua taught; Paris were a secular master, Alexander of Hales, taught the brethren before donning the Franciscan habit himself about 1230, thus bringing to the Order a chair of theology in the University; and lastly, Oxford, a little later. The popes supported the Franciscans' efforts to become part of the University.

This monastic invasion of the Universities soon met with opposition from the secular masters who were impelled either by jealousy or the desire to defend the independence of their corporation and the integral observation of its constitutions which they thought to be in danger. To make doubly sure William OF St.-AM0UR called for the suppression of the Mendicant Orders whose way of life, he claimed, was inimical to morality and religion, in his work *De periculis novissimorum temporum*', condemned by Alexander IV in the following year (Oct. 5th 1256). The controversy was rekindled in 1268 by the publication of the *Contra adversarium pcrjectionis Christiana* by Gerard of Abbeville (d. 1271). He was followed by Nicholas of Lisieux and the Council of Lyons was obliged to intervene in favour of the Mendicants, who, needless to say, had their own eloquent defenders[3].

The other Mendicant Orders followed 'he path traced out by their elder brethren. About 1285-1287 the *Hermits of St. Augustine* with Aegidius Romanus the future general of the Order also obtained the faculty of teaching[3]. The *Carmelites* received the same privilege in 1295 with Gerard of Bologna[4]. In every Order the chairs of theology gradually increased. Even the most retiring orders, such as the Cistercians[5] followed the general tendency, a characteristic indication of the intellectual vigour of the period.

II. THE FIRST DOMINICAN THEOLOGIANS.

A) The Augustinians.

Though they never formed a school in the true sense of the term the first Dominican theologians were *Augustinians* in the wide sense we have defined above[6]. They were as follows[7].

'See Denifle-Ciiatelain, *Chart. Univ, par.,* p. 331 and index.

' See p. 499.

3 Denifi.e-Chatei.ain, *Chart. Univ, par.,* I, p. 406, 556, 626. See below, p. 639. — 4 See M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 204.

5 Den IFI.E-Chatelain, *ibid.,* cf. indexes. The first Cistercian master at Paris was Guido de Elemosina, named in 1254.

6 Fr. Mandonnet, speaks of a " Augustinian Dominican school ", *op. cit., Diet, théol.,* col. 869-871. Fr. Martin, from his own study of these authors concludes *(op. cit.)* "There was never a Dominican School of Augustinians*' (p. 5S0). The divergence between these two writers appears to be mainly verbal.

7 Most of their works are unpublished. See the studies by Frs. Mandonnet and Martin mentioned above.

At the University of Paris:

Roland of Cremona (d. 1271) the first Dominican in the University (1229-1230). He went to Toulouse the same year (1230) *.

John of Saint Giles (d. 1258), English by birth, was a master at Paris, then at Toulouse in 1233 and finally at Oxford in 1235.

Hugh of Saint Cher (d. 1263) was for many years a master at Paris after 1230. He was several times provincial and became a cardinal in 1244. He had a great doctrinal influence and was concerned in the sending of St. Thomas to Paris in 1252.

Peter of Tarentaise (1225-1276) Pope Innocent V (1276), master at Paris from 1259 to 1265, then provincial and Archbishop of Lyons in 1274 and finally pope (January-June 1276).

At the University of Oxford the first Dominicans were Roger Bacon (d. 1248) already a master when he entered the Order, Richard Fishacre (d. 1248) Bacon's successor, and especially Robert of KlLWARDBY (d. 1279) master in theology after Fishacre from 124810 1261, English provincial (1261-1272), Archbishop of Canterbury (1272-127S a cardinal at Rome in 1278 where he died in the following year. This latter, says Fr. Mandonnet "was the most famous Dominican Augustinian of the age and perhaps should be ranked as the foremost of all the Augustinians of the time : ... both on account of the form of bis literary activity (many of his writings have an evident academic purpose) and the vigour and sureness of his teaching, Kilwardby was well qualified to be the leader of a school. The exalted positions he filled in his Order and the Church in England were all in his favour"1 As we shall see he strongly opposed the advent of Thomism 3. The attitude of Albert the Great was very different45

B) Saint Albert the Great s (1206-1280).

Albert was born in Swabia in 1206 (and not in 1193) to a very noble family. At the age of sixteen while pursuing his studies at Padua (1223) the preaching of Jordan of Saxony fired him and many others to enter the religious

1 Fr. Ehrle, *origini del primo studio gen. e la Somma teologica del pr. in. Solando da Cremona,* in *Miscellanea dominicana,* Rome, 192;, p. 85-134.

3 Fr. Mandonnet, *ibid., &ji.*

3 For some of his writings, see the *Notes* by M. D. Chenu, O. P., in *Rev. si. phil. théol.,* 1926 and 1927.

4 Though not a member of the Universities, St. Raymond of Pennafort should also be mentioned (d. 1275). He was a canonist and moralist, famous for his collections of *Decretals* (1234) and a *Summa pienilentia* (1235) : he refused the Archbishopric of Tarragona (1235) and evangelised the Spanish Moors.

5 Editions: *Opera omnia,* ed. Jammy, O. P., Lyons, 1651 (21 vols); new ed. Paris (Vives), 1S90 sq. (38 vols). Also various more critical partial editions.

Studies: P. Mandonnet, *Albert le Grand,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 666-674; *Did. hist.,* 1515-1524. P. von Loe, *De vita et scriptis B. Alberti Magni.* in *Analecta Boll.,* 1900-1902 (vol. XlX-XXi), 3 articles. M. Weiss, *Primordia nova bibliographic* B. Alberti* J/., Paris, 1898 (2nd ed. 19o). M. DE WULF, *pini méd.,* i, p. 376-388. All these works contain an abundant bibliography.

life in the Dominican Order. When he had completed the necessary studies he was set to teaching theology in various German monasteries and finally in 1245 was sent to Paris for three years in order to qualify as a Master. At St-Jacques the Dominicans possessed a theological college which had been incorporated in the University since 1229. Albert taught here with great success. In 1248 the Order founded four new *studia generalia* for theology. One of these faculties was at Cologne and Albert was called upon to organise and direct it. At this task overa period of 12 years (1248-1260) he gave himself up to unremitting intellectual work, hardly interrupted by his functions as provincial which he exercised from 1254 to 1257. In 1252 he acted as arbitrator in a serious dispute between the town and the bishop. In 1256 he went to Italy in order to prepare the defence of the Mendicant Orders attacked by the secular masters at Paris. It was then he wrote his *De unitate intellectus* against the Averroists and discovered a new treatise of Aristotle. At the same time he completed the main outlines of the vast scientific encyclopedia he had begun in Paris. In 1259 together with St. Thomas and Peter of Tarentaise he elaborated the general regulations for studies in the Dominican Order. He was named Bishop of Ratisbon in 1260, but resigned two years later in order to devote himself to study, which, however, did not prevent him from undertaking various missions in Germany. He returned to Cologne in 1268 and again began to teach. He contributed a memorandum to the controversy against the Averroists (1270) and visited Paris for the same purpose (1277). On his return, his health began to fail and he died in 1280. He was proclaimed a Doctor and Saint by Pius XI in 1931·

The works of Albert the Great are too numerous to be listed here. They may be grouped under two heads accordingly as they deal with *profane* or *sacred* learning [x].

Those treating of profane learning (or philosophy) deal with 1) *Logic* (10 works). 2) *Natural Sciences* (22 treatises). 3) *Meta-physics* (13 books, and a treatise to complete the 2nd). 4) *Moral Sciences* (10 books on Ethics and 8 on Politics)'. To these should

* See Mandonnet, *Did. théol.*, l. c.

' On the moral commentary " reported " by the young Thomas Aquinas, see p. 532.

be added a summary of the Natural Sciences *(isagoge)* and two *polemical* writings against the Averroists, from 1256 and 1270.

His works on sacred learning comprise : *a)* EXEGETICAL Works: various commentaries on the Old Testament (Psalms, Jeremías, Daniel, minor prophets) and the New (the four Gospels, Apocalypse); *b}* Theological Works : commentary on the Sentences (before 1249) and a *Summa de creaturis* [*(also a youthful work)s, a *Summa theologia* (posterior to 1270). His commentaries of the works of Dionysius the Areopagite are both theological and mystical. Together with his sermons they are the only certainly authentic spiritual writings: the *De adheerendo Deo* which was long attributed to him, was probably written by another[3].

The place in history of Saint Albert the Great must be considered from the scientific, the philosophical and the theological angle.

The nature of his influence is best revealed by his scientific work. His true claim to fame is "in the sagacity and the efforts he employed to bring a summary of the human learning already garnered, to the notice of the cultured society of the Middle Ages, to create a new and vigorous intellectual movement in his own century, to win over to Aristotle the best minds of the Middle Ages" [4]. He relied on Aristotle in the composition of the vast scientific *encyclopedia* that he had begun. He was not satisfied, of course, with making mere extracts or abridgements in the manner of Vincent of Beauvais ; he amended the philosopher's theories when they were opposed to the faith ; he also made them more complete; on the whole, however, he followed him faithfully, not only in his general division of the sciences a) *Logic,* b) *Physics,* i. e., natural sciences, mathematics, metaphysics, and c) *Ethics,* but also in their development. In short, he vulgarised Aristotle's learning, after having assimilated it himself.

A necessary consequence was the popularization of Peripatetic philosophy which was then an object of suspicion to the churchmen : its *naturalism* appeared incompatible with the faith. Albert's merit is to have understood that these difficulties were not unsurmountable and that like Plato, Aristotle also could be pressed into Christ's sendee. He himself corrected his teaching on many points, but was unable wholly to adapt it to the faith ; it was left to St. Thomas to complete his master's work. Albert was the pioneer and as such had cast about in many fields, maintaining for instance many Platonic elements deriving from the

[1] In 5 paris of which two only are published.

[3] The philosophical commentaries would seem to represent a period of intellectual development between the two *stimma.* 5*

[3] See p. 695. The *Paradisus anima,* and *De laudibus B. M. V.* (bk. Xll) and *Biblia mariana,* are also doubtful or apocryphal.

[4] P. Mandonnet, *Did. théol.,* col. 672-673I

Arabians or other sources r. The Dionysian school of spirituality hailed him as master in the XIVth century2 and at Cologne in the XVth century a college founded an Albertist school to compete with the Thomism taught in a neighbouring college; this experiment failed miserably and merely goes to shew the decadence of studies at that period3 5

St. Albert's theological teaching caused less stir 4. He remained faithful as a rule to traditional Augustinism, though he introduced *Aristotelian concepts* side by side or in place of current philosophical ideas. He also directly opened the way for St. Thomas by his ideas on " the relations between *science and faith;* their formal distinction, the impossibility of knowing and believing a same truth at the same time considered from the same standpoint, the introductory and persuasive function of science with regard to faith, and the radical inability of reason to explain the mysteries. To these elements of solution proposed by Albert, the Angelic Doctor added nothing that was entirely new " 5. Nevertheless, thanks to the more exact method of the latter " Theology, Augustinian and *practical* with Albert, became Aristotelian and speculative with his gifted disciple "6.7 In the Bull that proclaimed him a Doctor, Pius XI clearly set out the mission that St. Albert fulfilled as scholar and philosopher, as theologian and exegete, as saint, and apostle of peace 7.

III. THE FIRST FRANCISCAN THEOLOGIANS.

A) Alexander of Hales (i 180-1245)8

Alexander of Hales was the first to bring the Franciscans in contact with University theological studies and was thus

1 M. DE Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 382-383. — 3 See below, p. 702.
3 See Mandonnet, *Diet Hist.,* col. 1523. — 4 *Ibid.*
5 Th. 11eitz, *Les rapports entre la phil. et la foi,* p. 144. Cf. *ibid.,* 132-144.
6 *Ibid.,* p. 144.
7 See the list of studies published on the occasion of the canonisation of St. Albert in the *Documentation cath.,* 1932 (vol. 27) col. 393-408. *Vie Spirituelle,* special number, 1933. p. 1-184. *Maître Albert,* special publication by the *Revue thomiste,* 1932. *Bull of Canonisation, In thesauris sapientia',* in *Acta Apost. Sedis,* 1932, 5-17.
8 Wadding *op. cit.,* vol. 1, m, vi. Feret, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 311-324. Endres, *Des Alex. v. Hales Leben u. psychologitche Lehre* in *Phil. lahrb.,* 1888 (1), p. 24. Prosper de Martigné, *La scolastique et les trad, franciscaines,* 1888, p. 41-76. Hilarin de Lucerne, *Hist, des études de l'Ordre de S. Fr.,* Paris, 1908 (trans). A. Vacant, *Alex, de IL,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 772-7S5.

destined to great fame in the Order. As yet there exists no final authoritative work on his life and writings[1]. He was English by birth and finished his education in Paris where he became Master of Arts about 1210 and also, perhaps Doctor of Laws. Before entering the Order oí Friars Minor about 1231 he taught theology for the most part over a long period. Fie was the first occupant of the Franciscan chair in the University where he numbered among his pupils Jean de la Rochelle and also perhaps Saint Bonaventure who was to succeed him. The former was made his assistant about 1235 and took his place some years later. Alexander led the party that favoured study in the Order against those who desired a purely religious life and was very active in this direction about 1240[2]. He died in 1245.

The undoubtedly authentic works of Alexander oí Hales appear to be no more than his *Summa theologica,* a *Commentary of the Rule of St. Francis.* He certainly composed biblical commentaries but they have been lost, while those ascribed to him [3] are doubtful. Commentaries on Aristotle [4] and a *Concordia utriusque juris* have also been attributed to him. There remains no doubt that he was not the author of the *Mariale Magnum* and the *Expositio Missæ* found among his works, or even the *Summa dt virtutibus* incorporated in the Hird part of the *Sminila theologica* (d. 27-69) which seems to be due to William of Melito and is undoubtedly posterior to St. Bonaventure on whom it depends. Alexander does not seem to have left any commentary of the Sentences other than his great Summa in which his work mainly consists.

The Summa theologica of Alexander of Hales is a monumental work composed in the manner of Lombard's *Books of Sentences* «and therefore divided into 4 books, treating I. of God; II. of creatures; III. of Christ and the virtues; IV. of the sacraments and the last things.

A. de Serent, *id.,* in *Diet. Hist.,* col. 259-261. M. de Wulf, *Hist. ph. mid.,* I, p. 328-333· Introduction to the Qaarâcchi edition of the *Summa Theol.,* (p. 493, note 3). 4 I

[1] The Quaracchi editors reserve for a later date the volume of general criticism, also to contain Alexander's biography.

[2] doctrina! influence in general at this period, see A. CallebauT. OF M *Alex, de H. et sts confreres en face des condamnations parisienne, de 1241 et 1244, va Francefranciscaine,* Γγ.τλi

[3] On the Psalten* and the Apocalypse. I I

[4] Cf. DeNIFLE, *Chart. Univ. Par.,* i, p. 644

The author's death interrupted his work : the IVth part remained unfinished in the middle of the treatise on penance and in 1256 Alexander IV entrusted its completion to William of Melilol. This has given rise to thorny critical problems : what part of the extant work is due to Alexander and what to his continuator or continuator»? Were additions made, even in the parts written by Albert? Are there any grounds for Bacon's jest : " Quam ipse (Alexander) non fecit, sed alii"3. The new critical edition 3 should furnish a solution in the course of time. Meanwhile it provides a trustworthy text on which we can base a judgment of the doctrinal value of the work.

No general view of the doctrine of Alexander of Hales is possible until the completion of the new edition of his *Summa* and the settlement of the critical question. But the works that have already appeared provoke interesting observations. The favourite masters of the *doctor irrefragabilis* were St. Augustine, St. Anselm, and Hugh of St. Victor 4. He was an Augustinian in his teaching on illumination and in this he is in agreement with St. Bonaventure and his disciples 5. His psychology as a whole reveals him as the true founder of the Franciscan school 6. Contrary to what has been averred he clearly distinguishes theology from philosophy (by their object, method and the certainty proper to each) : he nevertheless co-ordinates rather than separates the two sciences7. His speculation is not devoid of a practical character, for it is imbued with the idea of *good* and this same idea gives the clue to all his theology : God is considered as the Good rather than cause 89 He is nevertheless known by His effects and the true proof of His existence is the argument from causality, although we naturally possess a certain "innate" knowledge of God's existence9. By these views

1 Denn1e, *Chari. Univ. Par.,* 1, 32S. — 2 R. Bacon, *Opus minus,* p. 326.

3 *Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de fíales 0. AI. Summa theologica,* Quaracchi, I (1924), II (1928). The editors have suppressed the early division of the hooks into questions, members and articles, and introduced others, not original, but very useful. The extant title is not the author's. The chief manuscript used for the edition is anonymous and dateless, but goes back to about 1250 according to the critics. The introductions of the two books already published do not deal with critical problems, but contain valuable doctrinal studies. — 4 *Introd.,* vol. 1, p. xxvm sq. — 5 *Ibid.,* p. xxxu-xxxiv.

6 *Ibid.,* p. XLii-Lii. —7 *Ibid.,* p. xxvi-xxix.

8 *Introd.,* vol. 1, p. xxxv-xxxvni. See also, p. xxx, 2.

9 Dicendum quod est cognitio (naturalis) de Deo duplex : cognitio actu, cognitio habitu. Cognitio de Deo *in habitu* naturaliter nobis impressa est, quia ipsa naturaliter est in nobis habitus impressus, scilicet similitudo primæ veritatis in intellecta, quo potest conjicere ipsum esse et non potest ignorari ab anima rationali. *Ibid.,* p. XXXI, 6.

and others of a similar nature prepared the way for St. Bonaventure.

B) The other Parisian masters of the Order of St. Francis, were, in addition to *St. Bonaventure;*

Jean de la Rochelle[1] (1200-1245) Alexander's first successor about 1238, author of various *Sumnut (de vitiis, de virtutibus, de praceptis, de articulis fidei* and chiefly *de anima)* The latter *(Summa de anima}* [2] is particularly important. Though he was a disciple of Alexander, Jean differed from his master as regards the application of the theory of matter and form to spirits. He made a clear distinction between essence and existence in creatures.

John Peckham[3] (d. 1292) the most famous of St. Bonaventure's own pupils at Paris, where he also taught in his turn, is especially known for his opposition to Thomism at Paris, Rome and in England where he succeeded Kilwardby as Archbishop of Canterbury (1279-1292). He had mystical leanings, and his chief aim appears to have been the maintenance of the traditional character of theology and the authority of St. Augustine which seemed to him to be falling on evil times[4]. He left a number of writings: questions, treatises and commentaries, of which several have recently been published[5].

William of Mara 67(d. 1298) also an Englishman and a pupil of St. Bonaventure is known for his *Correctorium fratris Thomal* (1277-1282), which, says M. de Wulf " is a true manifesto of the Franciscan school and the war-cry of the old scholasticism against Thomism

Matteo of Aquasparta [8] (d. 1302) another of Bonaventure's pupils, a master of Paris and Bologna, general of the Order in 1287, cardinal and Bishop of Porto in 1288, also makes some criticism of Thomism in his numerous writings.

At Oxford the Franciscan *studium* was founded by the man who had introduced philosophical lectures to the University, ROBERT GROSSE-TÊTE [9] (d. 1253) Chancellor of the University and Bishop of Lincoln in 1235 Io. He was

' M. de Wulf, *op. eit.,* 1, p. 333-334. P. Minges, *Tie scriptis quibusdam,* in *Arch, franc, hist.,* 1913, p. 597-662; *Zur Erkenntnislehre,* in *Phil. fahrb.,* 1914, p. 461-477. — 2 Edit. Domenichelli, Prato, 1882.

3 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 361-363.

4 See especially the letters published by Eh RLE, in *Zeitschrift fur hat. Theol.,* 1889. p. 172-193. Cf. *Chartul. univ. par.,* 1, p. 624, 627, 634.

5 *Quastiones de anima, de beatitudine corporis et anima,* etc.

6 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 363; 11, p. 34. E. Longpré, *G. at la Mate,* in *Francefranciscaine,* 1921-1922.

7 In which he criticises 118 points of theThomist teaching. See below, p.634.

8 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 358-361.

9 *Ibid.,* I, p. 335-339- H. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 1.

10 Although he resisted the pope more than once, he was not an adversary of pontifical authority as Protestants claim. Cf. Hurter, *op. cit.* He was a very zealous bishop.

the author of a great number of theological and philosophical treatises. As a man with scientific training he regarded "mathematical reasoning as the best dialectical method", says M. de Wulf, and it is due to him "that the prevalence of the mathematical outlook became a distinctive trait in the mentality of the Oxford professors" [1]. This was in evidence even among the monks.

Among the first Franciscan masters at Oxford should be mentioned :[2]

Thomas of York[3] (d. 1260) author of a work *On Aristotle?s Metaphysics;* a truly original and personal attempt at metaphysical systematisation, composed at the same time as that of St. Thomas.

William of Ware[4] (d. after 1267), who for a long time was thought to be the master of Duns Scotus. Of his writings there are extant, as yet unedited, questions on the Books of Sentences.

Richard Middletown or de Mediavilla[5] (d. about 1307-1308), was one of Bonaventure's pupil's but also independent enough to adopt a number of Thomist theses. He enjoyed great authority in the Franciscan Order, of which he was the most renowned master, after St. Bonaventure, at the end of the xmth century. The fame of both these great masters was to be overcast by that of Duns Scotus.

C) The following authors, extremely personal in their teaching, do not seem to have come within the ambit of any particular school :

Gilbert of Tournai[10] ^middle of the xmth cent.), was mainly a moralist and educator[7] zealous to lead souls to the most intimate union with God. "By reflecting upon herself the soul finds God and sees in the uncreated light the reason for her own knowledge. The height of scholarship[8] consists in a mystical contact with God, which the author treats in the manner of the School of St. Victor"[9].

Olivi or *Peter ofJohn Olivi*[10] (1248-1298, famous for his part in the Franciscan "spiritual" movement[11] was also a bold and independent philosopher. "In spite of his esteem for Augustine, Olivi rejected

[1] *Op. cit.,* I, p. 336.

[2] Others mentioned in M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 339-340, 371-372.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 340. — [4] *Ibid.,* p. 371-372.

[5] W. Lampen, in *Archivum franc, hist.,* 1925 (xvm), p. 298-360. General study, F. Hocedez, *Richard de Middleton,* Louvain 1925. D. J. Lechner, *Die Sakramentenlehre,* Munich, 1925. —[6] M. de Wulf, i, p. 372-373.

[7] He wrote a general treatise on education, *Eiudimentum doctrina,* of which the separate Hird part, forms the *De modo discendi,* written about 1250 for the son of the Count of Flanders. The *Eruditio region et principum* was composed before 1259 at the request of St. Louis.

[8] Read : education or moral and intellectual training.

[9] M. de Wulf., *op. cit.* — [10] *Ibid.,* 1, p. 364-370.

[11] *Ibid.* Olivi in his *Postilla in Apocalypsim* gives his own subtle explanation of the Book of Joachim regarding this subject.

his teaching in more than one point : he was not an Augustinian. He opposed Thomas Aquinas without naming him ; he cried out against Neoplatonic emanationism and though he called Alexander of Hales and St. Bonaventure his masters, he was mainly enamoured of his own ideas".

Blessed Raymond Lully[1] (1225-1315) "was a philosopher, mystic, polyglot and the most brilliant writer of the Middle Ages". He was above all an apologist, who endeavoured to defend the faith against the Averroists, and it is mainly from this standpoint that he should be judged. Apart from his mechanical method of demonstration[2] it should be remarked that he wrongly affirmed the necessity of faith as a condition of all intellectual knowledge, and that he exaggerated the power of reason enlightened by faith, claiming that it is "capable of deducing *a priori* all natural and supernatural truths... The remainder of his teaching reproduces traditional scholastic doctrine, but thrown together in indescribable confusion in an artificai framework based on the fancy of this fertile writer "[3].

Roger Bacon[4] (1210-1292 circa) was more at home in philosophy and the sciences than in theology. He nevertheless touches on the latter in nearly all his writings, especially in the first *Opus majus* (1267) and the last, the *Compendium studii theologice* (1292). He was mainly interested in method. He desired a more judicious use of the Bible (hence his corrections of the Vulgate) and a wider employ of the sciences by theologians whom he accused of ignorance, even the greatest, such as Alexander of Hales and Albert the Great. He considered that the theological studies of the time were rotten with seven capital sins[5]. He thought it his mission to apply the remedy : hence his anger in face of the opposition he at first aroused in the Franciscan Order. Among his teachings may be mentioned

[1] *Ibid.,* II, p. 143-146. J. Probst, *Caractère et origine des idées du Bx Raymond Lulle,* Toulouse, 1912; *L.a mystique de R. L. et l'art de contemplation,* in *Beitràge,* XIII, 2-3. E. LONGPRÉ, *Lulle,* in *Dici, théol.,* col. 1072-1141. Edit.: *Opera omnia,* Mainz, 1721-1740, 10 volumes.

[2] See especially the *Ars magna,* so mudi admired by Leibnitz.

[3] M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* p. 144-145. It is uncertain whether Blessed Raymond Lully was ever condemned.

[4] G. Delorme, *Bacon (R.)* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 8-31. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* p. 127-143. Very good bibliography in each author.

[5] *Opus minus,* Ed. Brewer, 1859, p. 322 sq. Cf. G. DELORME, *op. cit.,* col. 27-29.

a veritable *traditionalism* in advance of its time f and natural *illuminatiomstn* in the true meaning of the term, i. e., the attribution to God of the role of active intellect in the human soul2. The intemperant language and ideas of this great thinker did much to discredit him.

Roger Marston3 (d. 1298), using a slightly different terminology also taught an illuminationism very similar to Bacon's, though not akin to the ontologism 4 that St. Bonaventure and others s refuted and which was embodied in the 219 propositions condemned by the zealous Stephen Tern pier6.

CHAPTER IX.

Saint Bonaventure.

Special Bibliography :

Editions: *Opera omnia,* by the Franciscans of St. Bonaventure's College, Quaracchi, near Florence, 10 vols., 1882-1892. This should lake the place of all previous editions, including that of Vivès, Paris, 15 vols, 1864-1871. French trans. : *Théologie séraphique extraite et traduite des œuvres de S. B.,* 2 vols, Paris, 1853-1855. Berthaumier, *Œuvres spirituelles de S. Bonav.,* 6 vols, Paris, 1854-1855.

Studies:7 General studies: E. Smeets, ó". *Bonaventure,* in *Diet, théol., cg\.* 962-986. G. PALHORIÈS, 6'. *Bonaventure* (Coll. *La Pensee chréti),* Paris, 1913 (various texts). Prosper de Martigné, *La scolastique et les traditions franciscaines : S. Bonaventure,* Paris, 1888. Evangéliste de Saint-Béat, *Le Séraphin de l'Ecole,* Paris, 1900. Lives: L. de Chérancé, 5. *Bonav.,* Paris, 1899. E. Clop, S. *Bonav.* (Coll. *Les Saints),* Paris, 1922. L. Lem MENS, *Der hl. Bonav.,* Munich, 1909; Italian trans., 1921. Jules d'Albi, 5. *Bonav. et les luttes doct., de 1267 à 1277,* Paris, 1923. Philosophy : E. Gilson, *La philosophie de S. Bonaventure,* Paris, 1924 *{Etud. phil. méd.* iv), supersedes the majority of previous writings on the same subject. J.-M. Bissen, *I:exemplarisme divin selon S. Bonaventure,* Paris, 1929 *{Et. phil. méd.* IX). Sec also J. JEILER, S. *Bonaventura principia de concursu*

11. e., a primitive revelation that alone can explain the possibility of science and especially philosophy.

3 R. Cartox, *L'expérience mystique et Γillumination intérieure de 1\. Bacon,* Paris, 1924. See also *L'expérience physique;* and *La synthèse doctrinale, ibid.,* 1924. -- 3 M. DE WULE, *op. cit.,* p. 139-141. — 4 See above, p. 474.

5 *De hum. cognitionis ratione ;* Edit. *Obera omnia,* vol. V, p. 22 sq.

6 See above, p. 479-480.

7 We give only the more outstanding recent studies on the points treated in this chapter. A more complete bibliography may be found in the above mentioned works by Smeets, Palhoriès and 'socially Gilson.

Dei generali..., Quaracchi, 1897. Th. Heitz, *Essai historique sur les rapports entre la phil. et la foi,* p. 107-115. M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. méd.* I, p. 345-358. Theology and spirituality : T. DE Regnon, *Etudes sur la Trinité,* H, p. 435-568. A. Stohr, *Die Trinitdtslehre des hl. Bonav.,* Münster, 1923. B. Rosen MÔLLER, *Religiose Erkenntnis nach Bonav.,* Munster, 1925. E. Longpré, *La Théol. mystique de S. Bonaventure,* in *Arch, franc, hist.,* 1911 (vol. Xiv), p. 36-108. A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 187-199. P. FOURRAT, *La spiritualité chrétienne,* 1921, II, p. 261-277.

I. LIFE.

Saint Bonaventure and Saint Thomas were the greatest of the Schoolmen. Whilst the latter explored virgin ground in theology, the seraphic Doctor applied himself especially to the systemisation of the current, or Augustinian, theology, and therein lies the great interest of his work; he carried on the tradition of Alexander of Hales and prepared the way for Duns Scotus who gave the final form to Franciscan Augustinism. Saint Bonaventure's synthesis remains very faithful to the Augustinian spirit. It was indeed conceived with the intention of preserving this spirit in its entirety; hence the mystical nature of many of St. Bonaventure's theories, even in the philosophical domain, and especially his insistence on the idea of good in his theology. Meanwhile St. Thomas was also introducing method into traditional theology, but with a different conception. The powerful synthesis of the Angelic Doctor is objectively identical with Augustinian theology; it even remains faithful to its spirit in the sense that it preserves the capital theses on which that spirit is based; but it strikes out boldly in a new direction by its intellectual method and its assimilation of the Aristotelian philosophy. Its clarity and cohesion, its depth and simplicity have merited it the first place in the Church. Its official teaching in the Schools calls for a full exposition of its main outlines in a further chapter. We should not, however, overlook that other systemisation which has still so many uses. We shall explain it below with special reference to its method, endeavouring at the same time to give some picture of St. Bonaventure's personality and his doctrinal influence.

John of Fidanza, called *Bonaventure,* born in a little town in the neighbourhood of Viterbo in 1221, while still a child was cured of a serious illness bv the intercession

of St. Francis. Legend has seen in this episode a charming explanation of his name, while historically it was the source of his vocation to the Seraphic Order. He entered the Order in 1238 or more probably in 1243 x. He went to Paris for his studies where he was possibly able to make the acquaintance and even attend the lectures of Alexander of Hales (d. 1245) whom he calls "pater et magister noster". In 1248 he himself was teaching philosophy, commenting the Scriptures and the Books of Sentences. The majority of his theological writings date from this period. He occupied this position until 1257. Meanwhile St. Thomas having returned from Cologne about 1252 began his teaching at Saint-Jacques with his Commentary of Peter Lombard (1253-1256). Side by side they defended the right to teach, that had first been denied to the Dominicans (1252) and then the Franciscans (1254) and lastly to all the Mendicants, by William of St. Amour. St. Bonaventure wrote a number of excellent treatises, particularly the *De paupertate Christi,* against the latter 2. The monks finally triumphed and the symbol of their victory was the solemn installation of Thomas and Bonaventure as doctors, on October 23rd, 1257.

But Bonaventure who had been prevented from teaching since 1255 because of the secular opposition, had to give up his position at the very time he was made a doctor. During the year 1257 he was elected at the age of thirty-six to be Minister general of his Order. Henceforth he was entirely absorbed in his new duties 3 and his opportunities for theological study were rare. Fie governed his Order with great prudence during a particularly troublous period. Two movements were gathering impetus among the Friars; some, invoking the *Regula prima** and the *Testament* of St. Francis, were endeavouring to restore the primitive ideal of the founder; others desired to abide by the[4]

' Callebaut, O. M., *L'entrée de S. Bon. dans l'Ordre... en 12^^,* in *Eranci francise.,* 1921.

3 The *De paupertate Christi* forms part of the *Qticestiones disputat'?* (see p. ¡503). Three other opuscula date from this controversy : *Epistola de tribus qiucsttonibus. Determinationes quctslionum* and *Quare Ei atres minores ptcedicent et confessiones auaiant. Opera,* vol. vin, 331-336 ; 337'374 ; 375'3S5- *Tlie Apologia pauperum* is of a later date, probably 1269, when the master Gerard of Abbeville was again serving up the arguments of William of Saint-Amour against the Mendicants *(/bid.,* p. 230-330).

' See below, various writings in this connection, p. 504 505.

4 Approved orally by Innocent III.

Regula bullata which was accepted by St. Francis himself in 1223 1 and approved by Rome in the same year2. From the outset Bonaventure threw his weight on the side of the *Regula bullata* and imposed it on all. With the purpose of making union easier, he wrote a life of the blessed founder which was to supersede all others: the charm and piety of this *Legenda (major) Sancti Francisci* in 15 chapters is a model of religious biography; it was supplemented by a *Legenda minor* telling of the miracles obtained by his intercession after his death. St. Bonaventure wrote this life after a visit to the mountain of La Verna 1259 anc\ it was approved by the general chapter of Pisa in 12633. The saint presided various general chapters in which the government of the Order took definite shape. He zealously

to preach after he was made a superior. Among his listeners he numbered at times the highest placed personalities; doctors, cardinals, kings and popes. A considerable number of his sermons and lectures are extant [*]. "Though he never stirred up the masses as did St. Anthony of Padua and other famous Friars Minor of the period, his preaching did not lack force and power. His biographer, Francis of Fabriano, says of him : When he spoke all others held their peace" [2]. His preaching was moulded on a solid doctrinal foundation but the clearness and method with which the latter was explained, together with the liveliness and unction of the style, made it easy for all to understand. His discourses contain all the essential elements of the classical sermon : the *thema* (text), *prothema* (exordium), the development in one or several heads, the example, and lastly the peroration[3]. St. Bonaventure always adapted his matter and style to his hearers and was never loth to tackle topical subjects, particularly in his lectures. From this point of view, those he gave to university students on the *Hexaemeron,* at Paris in 1273, are especially valuable. They give us the last thoughts of this great doctor, for this series of lectures on the six days of Creation was suddenly interrupted.

Gregory X created Bonaventure a cardinal in June 1273, raised him to the See of Albano and would accept no refusal. He counted on his help in the Council of Lyons. The Saint obeyed, came to Lyons, retired from his post as Superior General of his Order in May 1274 and plunged himself wholeheartedly into the business of the Council, especially the matter of the union of the Greeks with Rome. This union was effected on July 6th, 1274. Eight days later Saint Bonaventure died, on the 14th July 1274. He was canonised in 1482 and declared a Doctor by Sixtus V in 15874.

II. WORKS.

Half of St, Bonaventure's work consists of extremely important *theological writings {Op. omn.,* vol. I-V). The remaining half, also of great value, treats of *exegetical, oratorical* and *ascetic* matters.[4]

[1] See below, p. 504 sq. — [2] E. Ci.OP, *op. cit.,* p. 104. — [3] *Ibid.,* p. 97.

[4] This pope founded St. Bonaventure's College at Rome for the Conventuals, and spread the study of the Seraphic Doctor's works.

A). Exegetical works.

The main extant writings under this head are his commentaries of four books of the Bible, two of the Old Testament *(Ecclesiastes* and *Wisdom)* [1]* and two of the New (Gospel according to *St. John,* and *St. Luke)* [2]. The latter, in which the author proposes to instruct preachers rather than exegetes, is the least scholastic of the four. He has been reproached with straining after the spiritual sense; but he does no more than base it on the literal sense according to the principle that he himself states : " Qui litteram Sacræ Scripturæ spernit, ad spirituales ejus intelligentias nunquam assurget". To these works should be added 79 *lectures,* or plans for lectures, on the Gospel of St. John[3]*

B). Theological works.

Under this head there are three works which may be classified as scholastic, and three others of a more marked ascetic nature.

i. The Commentaries of the IV Books of Sentences[4] form the main theological work of St. Bonaventure and provide the basis for all his later writings. lie faithfully follows the master's text, both in the order of the books and in the distinctions. After the analysis of each *distinction,* its teaching is methodically sifted and augmented in a series of *articles* subdivided into *questions.* At this point, in the " conclusion " or answer to objections, the doctor treats the most delicate metaphysical problems and gives proof of his genius. Saint Bonaventure's commentary is exceptionally profound; together with that of St. Thomas, it stands out from the immense mass of literature occasioned by Peter Lombard's work. It has been claimed that St. Bonaventure sometimes copied his predecessor, Alexander of Hales, particularly with reference to the end of Book III on the virtues *(Dist.* 26-69) which is to be found almost to the letter in Alexander's *Summa.* In reality, this treatise on the virtues is interpolated in Alexander, having been extracted from Bonaventure's writings [5]. It is also pointed out that Book IV, on the sacraments, probably the first to be written, is weaker than the others : a certain vagueness in the doctrine, and even opinions that can no longer be maintained [6]. These very understandable defects are largely outweighed by the admirable qualities of the work as a whole.

1 *0/>. omnia,* vol. VI, p. I-103 and 105-235.
- *Ibid.,* vi, p. 237-532 and \ II, p. 1-604. 3 *Mia.,* vi, p. 532-634.
4 *Ibid.,* i-iv. Probably composed between 1248 and 1255.
5 See above p. 518. — 6 See below, p. 493.

2. The **Breviloquium**[1] is a little theological summa containing a summary of the preceding work. In addition to the introduction on the study of the Holy Scriptures it comprises seven parts concerning I. The Trinity; 2. the creation; 3. sin; 4. the Incarnation; 5. grace; 6. the sacraments; 7. the last things.

3. Three series of **Quæstiones disputatæ**[2] which remained for a long time unedited, shed precious light on a number of points in his teaching: They contain seven cjuestions *De scientia Christi*[3], eight *De mysterio Trinitatis*[4], and four *De perfectione Evangelica*[5].

4. In spite of its complex character, or precisely because of it, we may class among the theological writings the most famous and the most profound of St. Bonaventure's writings, the **Itinerarium mentis ad Deum**[6]. This work was written by the saint on the mountain of La Verna in 1259 for the purpose of guiding souls to contemplation. For its proper understanding a twofold error should be avoided: it is neither a purely mystical work, void of philosophy, nor a philosophical treatise without a mystical content. The end pursued by the author, as well as the spirit that animates it, renders it essentially mystical; but in the development of his ideas, St. Bonaventure made use of an extraordinary number of philosophical and theological concepts with which ten years of teaching had made him familiar and which form, as it were, the framework of the whole book. An abstract of this powerful masterpiece will be given below[7].

5. The little opusculum **De reductione artium ad theologiam** indicates six different lights by which man is enlightened in this world, whilst awaiting the light of glory. These are the lights of Holy Writ, of knowledge by the senses, of mechanics, of rational philosophy, of natural philosophy, and moral philosophy. The present title[9] excellently renders the author's intention: to consider God as the centre of all things and subordinate all knowledge to Him, discovering in everything that is the result of human thought, the enlightening action of God.

6. The **Collationes in Hexaemeron**[10] contain a similar teaching on the seven "progressive illuminations" that Bonaventure ascribes to man. They are explained by comparing them with the days of Moses: hence the title of the writing. These 23 lectures deal with the noblest truths of dogmatic and mystical theology. They were intended

[1] *Opera, N,* p. 199-291. Work written before 1257.
[2] *Ibid.,* v, p. 1-198. — [3] *Ibid.,* p. 1-43.
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 44-115. — [5] *Ibid.,* p. 117-198. — [6] *Opera,* v, p. 293-316.
[7] See *Doctrine,* p. 519-522. — [8] *Opera, N,* p. 317-325.
[9] This title is recent. The manuscripts are often entitled, *Senno, Senno de septem artibus mechanicis,* or *Tractatus de origine scientiarum, De ortu scientiarum:* Sbaralea proposes *De illuminationibus.*

for university students, in order to put them on their guard against current errors, too often spread by the professors themselves, especially at Paris.

C). Oratorical works.

St. Bonaventure's oratorical work is vast, especially since the publication of a great number of manuscript sermons by the Quaracchi editors. This work comprises lectures *(collationes)* and *sermons.*

Under the heading lectures we have already mentioned the 79 *Collationes in Evangelium Joannis* among the exegetical works, and the 23 *Collationes in Hexaemeron* among the theological writings. To these we may add 9 *Collationes de septem donis Spiritus Sancti*[1] and 7 *Collationes de decem prceceptis** whose titles sufficiently indicate their subjects.

Far more numerous are the sermons which have been classed under five heads : first a little group of 5 *theological sermons*[2] which, like the *collationes,* may be grouped with theology : then come four series, edited separately, containing 475 sermons, thus distributed : 1. *Sermones de tempore:* 2. *Sermones de Sanctis;* 3. *Sermones de beata Maria Virgine;* 4. *Sermones de diversis*\ Many consist of no more than an outline, usually taken down by hearers and not revised by the author; they have many defects. Exception must be made for 53 that are printed at the head of the *Sermones de tempore* for each Sunday, written by Bonaventure himself and revealing the gifts of a great orator. It is possible also that he wrote the treatise *De arte prtzdicandi*[3], or rules for Christian eloquence, though the authenticity of this work is not entirely guaranteed.

D). Opuscula on spirituality or on the Franciscan Order.

St. Bonaventure's spiritual opuscula are few in comparison with those that have been attributed to him and which must be rejected as *spurious* or at least *doubtful*^. The ten retained by the editors are for the most part short, but concise and substantial; and some pages are sublime[7],

rt) The *Incendium amoris* or *Itinerarium mentis in seipsum,* also entitled De triplici via[8], " teaches how the soul may

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 455-503. Not to be confused with the *De septem donis Spiritus Saneti* of earlier editions which is due to another author.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 505-532. They date from 1267 or 1268 and were probably written before the last mentioned.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 532-579: *Sermones selecti de rebus theologicis.* The fifth is really an opusculum or treatise *De plantatione paraaisi.*

[4] *Opera,* IX, p. 23 46l ; 463-631 » 633-721 ; 722-731.

[5] *Opera,* ix, p. 1-21. —[6] See the list in G. Pa i.HORIES, *op. cit.,* p. 363-365.

[7] G. Palhoriès, *op. cit.,* p. 224 sq.

[8] *Opera,* vm, p. 3-27. See Smeets, *op. cit.,* col. 972.

come to true wisdom or union with God through love, by the threefold way of meditation, prayer (of petition) and contemplation In the three chapters of this work the author makes no long developments, but contents himself with numerous and brief indications of the lines to be fo'lowed. These are sometimes astoundingly subtle.

M The Soliloquium * and the Lignum vitæ3 are meditations. The *Soliloquium* contains, in dialogue form (the soul interrogating and the interior man replying), a series of pious considerations on : i) the results of sin; 2) the fickleness of the things of this world; 3) death; 4) the last things. The *Lignum vite?* is composed of 48 very short meditations on the life and death of the Saviour.

i) The following also concern Our Lord Jesus Christ : 1) De quinque festivitatibus pueri Jesu3 (Conception, Nativity, Holy Name, Adoration of the Magi, Presentation) in which Bonaventure explains the spiritual meaning of these feasts and by means of sensible objects inculcates the highest supernatural truths; 2) the Vitis mystica4 in which the author takes the properties, the culture and the fruits of the vineas similes for the Saviour.

λ) Other writings consist in *simple collections of devotion* or *spiritual guidance.* The De sex alis Seraphim5 expounds to superiors (symbolised by the seraphim) the virtues that their state entails: 1. zeal for justice; 2. charity for others; 3. patience; 4. an exemplary life; 5. prudent discretion ; 6. a devout love of God. — The De præparatione ad. missam6 contains advice for the celebration of mass. — The Officium de passione Domini 7 is a collection of psalms and prayers. — The opuscula De perfectione vitæ ad sorores and De regimine animæ 8 treat especially of the interior life.

With these may also be classed a number of St. Bonaventure's works concerning the religious life and especially the Franciscan Order. The best known are his two lives of St. Francis *(Legenda)** and the works composed in defence of the mendicant Orders : *De paupertate Christo* (about 1258),0, *Apologia pauperum*ll (about 1269) and the three opuscula already mentioned ,a. The remaining eight are special rules or explanations of the Rule and letters dealing with the administration of the Order '3.

1 *Ibid.,* p. 28-67 : *Soliloquium de quatuor mentalibus exercitiis.* Also entitled *Imago vita·, meditationes.* Modelled on Hugh of St. Victor.

' *Ibid.,* p. 68-87. Also entitled *Arbor crucis, Contenípiatio de Passione Domini.*

i *Ibid.,* p. 88-98. — 4 *ibid.,* p. 159-189.

s*Ibid.,* p. 131-151. — 6 *Ibid.,* p. 99-106.

7 *Ibid.,* p. 152-158. — 8 *Ibid.,* p. 107-127 and 128-130.

9 *Ibid.,* p. 504-564 *(Legenda maior),* 565-576 *(Legenda minor).* " Legenda " here possesses the etymological meaning of a document " to be read ". See above Life, p. 500.

10 Among the *Qucestiones disputatee,* p. 503.

" *Ibid.,* p. 230-330.

" *Ibid.,* 331-385. See above, Life, p. 499-500.

'3 *Ibid.,* 386-503.

III. DOCTRINE.

A). The Doctor.

Christian piety[1] has always tended to link together the names of St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas[2] This association is due to the doctrinal genius they both displayed. Of all the doctors who lived after the period of the Fathers they undoubtedly occupied the first rank. Both were outstanding as theologians. St. Bonaventure, unlike St. Thomas, did not compose a Summa theologica, but he commented the *Books of Sentences* and the depth and penetration of this vast work makes it a model of its kind.

Though the method he adopted constrained him to build upon the accepted framework of the time, Bonaventure's genius is revealed in many admirable and personal opinions, while his kindly and affectionate nature is reflected in the moving passages he wrote as a worthy son of St. Francis.

The work of the Seraphic Doctor also reveals him as a mystic; and this is one of the marks that distinguish him from St. Thomas. As a general rule the latter relies on the Scriptures, tradition and reason, in his doctrinal explanations, while St. Bonaventure on the contrary, like a true disciple of Augustine, has recourse to the nobler enlightenment of the gifts of the Holy Ghost for which a perfect and virtuous Christian life alone forms the preparation. No doubt his purely spiritual works are few and short and not to be compared with those of St. Bernard, whose tendencies were predominantly practical, both in his teaching and his description of supernatural graces. Nevertheless, like St. Anselm and the School of St. Victor, he marked his entire theological work with an intense mystical emotion, that wholly imbues his teaching. In this consists his originality.

St. Bonaventure was also in the full meaning of the word, a thinker, a philosopher. To his discussion of the truths of faith he brought a boldness in speculation equalled only

[1] Influenced by the authority of the popes, especially Sixtus V (Bull *Triumphantis Hierusaient)* and, later, Leo XIII (Letter dated 13th Dec. 1885 to the Minister General of the Friars Minor). See E. SHEETS, *op cit,* col. 975, 982.

[2] It is quite possible and even likely that the two doctors were personal friends though there is no documentary proof of this. Their somewhat divergent doctrinal tendencies, however, present no obstacle.

by his perfect submission to the word of God, and his docility to the light of grace. He never discussed from a purely philosophical angle the problems that concern the proper objects of reason, such as the world, matter, the soul, the foundations of knowledge and morality. He deals with these in a theological context, endeavouring to explain them, like a true philosopher, with reference to the principles that are proper to their domain, but always bearing in mind the higher order of grace. The great problem of his time was that of *knowledge,* intimately bound up with another, no less important for the Christian, that of the relation between reason and faith. The Aristotelian teaching on knowledge included no reference to supernatural principles. St. Thomas utilised this naturalist philosophy, but carefully *distinguished* the two orders of nature and grace, and of reason and faith [1]. St. Bonaventure conceived this concession to be dangerous : he admitted the principle of this distinction, as a possibility ; but he condemned it in practice as derogatory to God's will which has imposed the supernatural order on man.

It is essential that St. Bonaventure's attitude towards this important question should be properly grasped. Four different functions of human reason may be distinguished. It can serve i. either to explain nature in itself by reference to purely rational principles without any explicit appeal to transcendent reasons or any other aim than that of being faithful to truth ; 2. or to explain nature by its own principles always envisaging (explicitly or implicitly) a higher order, especially the mystical union of the soul with God ; 3. or to explain the truths of faith already established by the argument from authority; 4. or, lastly, to explain the nobler experience ol the mind, enlightened by the mystical gilts and meditating on God or on the world inasmuch as the latter is the work of God and leads to Him. The first of these rational exercises is purely and simply *philosophy;* the second philosophy with a special bias, in this case with a *mystical tendency;* the third is *purely theological* and the fourth *contemplative theology* or *mystical philosophy.* St. Bonaventure admits and practises the last three but rejects the first, and in this, of course he differs from St. Thomas. He does not, of course, refuse man the faculty of creating a purely rational science of nature, a purely human philosophy in the manner of Aristotle and Plato, but he denies his right to do so[2]. Nevertheless, for St. Bonaventure the mind still disposes of a great deal of freedom, in the three orders he recognises, especially in theology, but also in philosophy, to which he gives a marked mystical character.

[1] See below, p. 572.

[2] He also denies that such philosophies are able to avoid error on essential matters that form the base or summit of philosophy. See E. GILSON, *op. cit.,* p. 94-114.

All are agreed in recognising in St. Bonaventure a mystical philosopher, but this appellation requires some explanation. A mystical philosopher may be one who deliberately includes in his philosophy elements that are strictly mystical, so that his speculation on the world, for instance, is not based on rational data alone, but on truths known by faith, especially a radiant and luminous faith, enlightened by the gifts. Such speculation, which concerns itself not only with revealed truth, but with the world and creatures, may be termed philosophy or mystical philosophy on account of its object. Nevertheless, since it invokes the light of faith, the name of *theology* or *applied theology* is more fitting. With regard to its final cause we may term it *contemplative theology.* Much of Saint Bonaventure's writing comes under this head, including the most famous of his opuscula '. Apart from this however there is a great deal that truly merits him the title of philosopher in the true sense of the term.

The Seraphic Doctor is also a mystic *by the very orientation of* his philosophy[3]. Though he composed no Summa, he conceived a rigorously co-ordinated philosophical doctrine with remarkable and methodical exactitude[3]. But in so doing, Bonaventure had another end in view. Unlike St. Thomas who created a purely natural and rational philosophy, the Franciscan doctor subordinated his philosophy to a higher knowledge to which it serves as a foundation. A result of this orientation is evident in his solution of even natural problems, as will be seen below. Though his teaching, on account of this special bias, cannot be unreservedly termed philosophy[4], it nevertheless remains a philosophical teaching with a mystical tendency. This character of his teaching, though possessing obvious disadvantages, has also great merits[5], for it tends to facilitate the explanation of the eminent graces of contemplation and prepare the mind fortheir reception. St. Bonaventure's philosophy, however, is not the only one that provides a solid and rational foundation for the mystical life. All true philosophy, based on an exact knowledge of the soul should suffice, and in this respect that of St. Thomas is especially trustworthy[6].

From what has been said it is not difficult to recognise the masters whom St. Bonaventure preferred. He himself voiced his feelings in the famous sermon " Christ, the master of all "[7]. In *Aristotle* he found knowledge, the gift of interpreting natural things; in this respect he esteemed him the best of philosophers[8], though he charges him with

' See aliove, p. 503 and 522 sq. I ·

2 This point of view should not he confused with the foregoing. " Λ mystical philosopher does not necessarily take into account the philosophical explanation of mystical graces; while should he do so, he need not possess the gifts themselves that characterise the true mystic.

3 See E. Gilson, chap. 1, p. 11-12 and *passim.*

4 In the sense that he delimits the universal application of the philosophy in question. — 5 The two elements are finely associated by E. Gilson in his synthesis.

6 See below, p. 597.

7 *Senno de Cnristo uno omnium magistro; Opera,* V, p. 572. II ·

8 Excellentiorem inter philosophos; *In Sent.,* bk. II, Dist. I, p. 1, a. 1 q 2

always "looking towards the earth"[1]; hence his great errors: ignorance of exemplarism, of Divine Providence and of the last things[2]. To *Plato's* lot fell wisdom; he was acquainted with higher and nobler ideas and reasons, yet neither he nor his disciples were able to avoid error since they lacked the true faith[3]. The true master, Christ, found his ablest interpreter in *Augustine,* to whom, through the medium of the Holy Ghost, He gave the language of wisdom and of knowledge. Bonaventure always has recourse to this great doctor in his doctrinal explanations; in all important matters of the theology of the interior life he invokes his aid. He founded a tradition in his Order. Since the time of Bonaventure the Franciscan theologians glory in being disciples of St. Augustine.

The Seraphic doctor accomplished still more, for he codified, as it were, though not in its final form[4], Franciscan Augustinism. There is no doubt that his school, though not the sole exponent of the Augustinian *spirit,* embodied it in a very eminent degree. The *doctrinal corpus* of saint Bonaventure does no more than reproduce the master's teaching on many points, while in a number of others it transcends it. His clarification and completion of the profound though summary data of the Bishop of Hippo are mainly found in philosophy. He introduces a methodical classification that is occasionally astoundingly subtle. Whatever he found to serve his purpose in Aristotle he borrowed without scruples; he was influenced by Jewish and Arabian philosophers[6] and still more by Dionysius the Areopagite. He reaped the harvest of two centuries of intense and abundant Christian thought, and his work which represents its term, furnishes a complete, powerful, and homogeneous synthesis. Though it may not, perhaps, be entirely identified with St. Augustine's teaching, in spite of the spirit that wholly imbues it, it nevertheless constitutes a magnificent interpretation. Others may be found equally satisfying, but none so fine[7].

[1] *Serm.* iv, *De rebus theol.,* i8 ; *Opera,* v, p. 572.
[2] *In Hexaem.,* VI, 1-5. — [3] *Ibid.,* VII, 3-12.
[4] St. Bonaventure's synthesis was fairly radically revised by Duns Scotus.
[3] i. e., theory of the two intellects, very current at this period.
[6] For instance, the teaching of the hylomorphic composition of spiritual substancesis due to Avicebron, though Bonaventure attempts to ascribe it to Augustine.
[7] The very complexity of Augustine's work renders it refractory of inclusion in a single synthesis.

B) Philosophical teaching*.

We shall mention here only the more outstanding theses of St. Bonaventure's philosophy. They form part of a homogeneous and complete system, unlike that of St. Thomas. A result of this is to make comparison difficult even when the two doctrines agree, for the point from which they begin, their general inspiration and their tendencies, give to each a characteristic note, even though they proceed on parallel lines *. A good instance of this in Bonaventure's philosophy is the pre-supposition of the *existence of God,* the Creator; not because reason is incapable of demonstrating His existence, but rather because it scarcely needs to do so, this truth being self evident3, and also because faith gives a particular power of penetration to reason, even as regards truths of the natural order that belong to its domain.

I. For St. Bonaventure the central idea of philosophy is exemplarism; as E. Gilson observes, he regards it as "the very essence of metaphysics"3. Thus, at the outset, Bonaventure differs from St. Thomas, who, though he finds a place for exemplarism in his metaphysics, prefers to regard it as a corollary4. The reason why Bonaventure attributes such importance to this question is no doubt partly in an endeavour to exclude Aristotelianism, but mainly to give a philosophical explanation of the world that shall be as exhaustive as all the resources of reason and faith can make it. Consequently he prefers to consider created beings, not in themselves, but in their cause, the divine essence, and notably in the divine ideas that constitute their eternal exemplars. These ideas which we distinguish in the Divine Mind are, moreover, one with its essence 6. The Divine Essence, cause and model of all things, has engraved on each thing the ineffaceable impression of its thought; sometimes but a *shadow,* when the divine resemblance is remote and confused, sometimes a *trace,* when the resemblance is distinct,

' See E. GlLSON, *op. at.,* p. 472-473 (conclusion) and *passim.*

* See below, p. 516. — 3 *Op. cit.,* p. 157. See also Fr. Bissen's excellent study.

4 See below, p. 593. — s E. Gilson, *op. at.,* ch. iv, p. 141-159.

1·. Gilson notes a shade of difference between Saint Bonaventure and St. Ihomas, though at bottom they agree. St. Thomas conceives the divine ideas as being simple representations *o(* objects, while St. Bonaventure would seem to consider them inasmuch as they produce these objects. Duns Scotus was thus launched on his teaching of a ' God Who creates essences absolutely"; *op. al.,* p. 59.

though still far removed from the divine (deriving from causality alone), sometimes, finally, an *image,* when the resemblance is near and clear-cut, as in the case of the *soul* which not only has God for its cause but also as the object of its specific operation *, These divine resemblances are the foundation of the universal *analogy* of beings[2] that reflect the Godhead [3] and which are intelligible only inasmuch as they are a representation of God and the divine idea that is realised in them [4].

2. St. Bonaventure examines with no less independent views the general problems that arise from a study of nature. Here are his solutions of the main questions.

a) As may be expected, he affirms creation *ex nihilo,* which entails creation *in tempore.* On this point he was not followed by St. Thomas, who, though he does not deny the fact, considers eternal creation to be possible, out of deference to Aristotle who affirmed it. This opinion of Aristotle is judged to be contradictory by Bonaventure, who, insisting on the *ex* of the expression *ex nihilo,* sees in it the basis of a relation of anteriority and posteriority[5]. He adds five other arguments, particularly that of the impossibility of an infinite number which is implied by such a teaching ; for since the world was made for man, we would be obliged to suppose an infinite number of men, unless we admitted the absurd hypothesis of metempsychosis or the single intellect[6]. From this it is evident that the great doctor had already come to grips with Averroism, even before the great controversy about the year 1270.

b) A more important question is that of the composition of created beings. In these Bonaventure sometimes distinguishes three elements: matter, form, and their conjunction. This latter element appears to have been included merely to justify his symbolism when he sought for analogies of the Trinity in creation[7]. *Matter* and *form,* however, as well as essence and existence, and actuality and potentiality, are truly distinct realities in all created essences, for these concepts are reciprocal. It follows from this that even the *angels* are composed of matter and form, and cannot be termed " subsisting forms " [8].

1 See *hi I Sent.,* Dist. III, 1st p., a. I, q. 2. See also *Itin.,* 1, 2; *In Hexaeni.,* 11, 20 sq. — 2 See E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* ch. VII, p. 196-227.

3 The Christian, knowing the Blessed Trinity, may find traces of it in creation. Hence the number of threefold divisions to be found in Bonaventure's work, even in the constitution of beings : matter, form and the composition of the two.

4 The doctrine of analogy is fundamentally the same for both Bonaventure and Thomas; but whereas the former sees it as tending to lessen the distance between Creator and creature, the latter tends to insist on the gulf that separates them. See E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 225-227.

5 Creatio *ex* nihilo ponit esse *post* non esse. *In II Sent.,* D. I, p. *1,* a. 1, q. 2.

6 See E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 183-188. — 7 *In Hexaëni.,* 11, 23.

8 *In II Sent.,* D. IIT, p. 1, a. 1, q. I.

Here, of course, *matter* is not opposed to the pure spirituality of the angels'; it merely connotes the principle of mutability and "passibility" both inseparable from any contingent being composed of actuality and potentiality[1]. In addition it constitutes the principle of individuation. St. Bonaventure thus avoids the extremes to which St. Thomas was led when he affirmed that each angel is a single species[3].

c) According to St. Bonaventure, form is not, as St. Thomas has it, a principle that absolutely limits a given nature by giving it a substantial perfection, but rather a principle that renders a substance capable of receiving fresh perfections; hence the teaching of the *plurality of simultaneous forms*[4,5] particularly in the case of luminous bodies which possess in addition to their constitutive form, the complementary substantial form of lights. Further, matter which is capable of receiving several forms is not merely a passive aptitude for reception, for this, according to St. Bonaventure, would oblige us to ascribe to secondary causes, a truly creative power. We must therefore admit that there are certain forms in matter in a state of latent virtuality, like a kind of "seed", which are capable of development by natural agents; these are the *seminal reasons* which form a link between matter and form[6]. Here again is one of the essential points on which St. Bonaventure differs from Thomistic teaching.

3. The soul, in a philosophy with a mystical tendency such as that of St. Bonaventure, naturally occupies a large part.

a) The human soul, of itself, apart from the body, is a complete substance; moreover, like the angels, it is composed of matter and form, and does not thereby shed any of its spirituality. This suffices for its individuation[7]. It is able, nevertheless, to enter into composition with the organised body of which it is the form, so as to make a substantial whole, thanks to its seminal reasons, those latent virtualities which call for fulfilment, just as those of the body, though it possesses its own form, find their complement in the soul[8].

b) Bonaventure distinguishes various faculties in the soul. In determining their *relations with the essence of the soul* he refers to what St. Augustine says on this subject in his *De Trinitate*. It should be remembered however that in this work St. Augustine was mainly concerned with showing that the soul is an image of God, One in Three, with the aim of finding congruent reasons for the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. His purpose was thus chiefly mystical and theological[9]. Saint Bonaventure follows him closely,but gives greater precision to his doctrine in the philosophical order, the better to refute current errors. He admits

1 See E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 22S sq. — 3 *Ibid.,* p. 238 sq.
3 E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 236-237.
4 *Ibid.,* p.266-267. See also, p. 310.
5 *Ibid.,* p. 264-265 — 6 *Ibid.,* p. '281-290. — 1 *In II Sent.,* D. 17 sq.
8 This teaching of the hylomorphic composition of spiritual substances is borrowed from Avicebron. See above, p. 475.
9 See vol. 1, p. 646-648. Sr. Augustine's observations are direct and practical, rather than the result of a philosophical conception. r

neither the radical identification of the soul and its faculties' nor the rigorous distinction made by St. Thomas, who regarded the latter as simple accidents or at least properties inseparable from the substance; he conceives them as distinct from the soul inasmuch as they are faculties, but identified with it by all the positive content of their being, so that they fall under the genus substance rather than that of accident. They are like "the immediate premotions of substance"[1], for the human soul cannot be conceived apart from the threefold powers of memory, understanding and love.

< The memory is an operation rather than a faculty. The essential faculties of man are *intelligence* and W//, forming part *of* the rational soul. In addition, St. Bonaventure recognises two inferior faculties, *vegetative* and *sensitive*. The operations of the latter[3], moreover, are closely connected with the rational soul which acts upon them unceasingly in order to guide and perfect them. On the other hand, sensible objects form an indispensable condition for the soul's spiritual activity. Abstract ideas are extracted (abstracted) from sensible objects by the *intellect*. The latter performs its operation in two stages: 4*the *active intellect* alone does not abstract the intelligible object from the sensible; rather does it prepare this abstraction, which is completed by the *possible intellect*. This, in its turn, is able to grasp the intelligible, but not extract it unaided from its material matrix. Hence the two intellects are scarcely distinct faculties, but rather " two correlative aspects of the same operation "[s].

4. Like the true Augustinian that he was, St. Bonaventure attaches great importance to the formation of first principles for they are the light of the soul and make it an *image of God*. He often calls them " innate ", an expression that many of his commentators have taken literally. This explanation, however, even in its most attenuated form, goes entirely contrary to "the profound truth of the Augustinian system"[6], for innate ideas would exclude God's special co-operation in the exercise of the faculties. All that Bonaventure really admits to be innate is the intellect, the principles are acquired. " The principles constitute the first knowledge acquired by our inteligence, and it forms them with such spontaneous ease on its first contact with

l According to certain early scholastics, Aicher de Clairvaux, for instance, the faculties are no other than the soul itself, inasmuch as it directs its attention to particular objects. See E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

2E. Gilson's expression, *op. cit.*, p. 332. See *ibid.*, p. 328-333.

p. 335-346.

4St. Bonaventure finds no difficulty in admitting the distinction of the two intellects and he thus makes Augustine's teaching more precise. He conceives them, however, in quite another manner from St. Thomas, in keeping with his tendency to stress the soul's activity and free it from the operation of the senses. See E. Gilson, *op. cit.*, p. 347-353.

'*Ibid.*, p. 353. — 6 *Ibid.*, p. 356. Sec *ibid.*, various interpretations, p. 354-356.

exterior reality, that we find it difficult to imagine that they are not virtually latent in the thought that gives them birth First principles, therefore, are formed *spontaneously.* They are brought to bear on known truths by a kind of intuition. Such are the first truths that guide *all man's rational activity,* not only in the *speculative* or theoretical order but also in the *moral* or practical order. This is true, both as regards the natural inclination of the noblest part of the soul towards the Good *(synderesis)* and the discrimination that is inade by the conscience between the doing of good and evil-. Such also is the *self-knowledge* acquired by the intelligence as soon as it acts λ From this self-knowledge it derives a knowledge of God 4, of Whom the soul is the image, precisely because of the principles by which it is enlightened and which God produces in the soul for this purpose. This of course, brings us to the great Augustinian problem of special illumination.

This teaching has often enough been misunderstood. St. Bonaventure himself refuted the forerunners of *Ontoloedsm* who claimed that man, even in this life, could see God in His essence, and all things in God. Nor did he teach that God fulfilled the function of the active intellect in the human mind, even as regards knowledge of the principles : the abstract given above suffices to shew this56 His teaching may be reduced to what is termed contuition *(contuitus)*0. This consists in an indirect knowledge of God, based on a special divine co-operation which guarantees the certitude of our knowledge of first principles, together whith that necessity and immutability that are the condition of truth. These qualities can derive neither from objects perceived nor from ourselves: they can be explained only by the action of the divine ideas on our first ideas. This activity is neither an explicit divine revelation nor the pure and simple creation of our knowledge, but a *movement* and a *nitide;* its principle is the "ratio æterna ut regulans et motiva"7. Though this activity must be immediate8, it does not afford an intuition of God; He is apprehended only in His work

* *¡bid.,* p. 357. After citing various explicit texts (Chiefly in *// Scut., Dist.* 39, a. I, q. 2, conci.), the author concludes, in a note : "This is exactly what St. Thomas teaches on this question". And yet M. Gilson himself has pointed out the philosophical differences between St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas. — ' E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* ch. xm, Moral illumination.

3 The soul reflects upon itself and knows itself directly; this is a cardinal point of Bonaventuran philosophy.

4 See below, p. 516-517. — 5 For these errors, see above p. 474.

6 E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 379-387. B λ

7 Ad certitudinalem conditionem necessario requiritur ratio æterna ut regulans et ratio motiva, non quidem ut sola et in sua omnimoda claritate, sed cum ratione creala, et ut ex parte a nobis contuita secundum statum viæ. *De scientia Christi* IV, conci. — See *ibid.*

and through it: that is to say simple "contuition"[1]. These subtle analyses are admirable, but they should not be isolated from other aspectsofa teaching that is as rich as it is complex[2].

The special illumination of the Augustinians cannot obviously be reduced to this natural contuition[3]. From one aspect, philosophically, St. Augustine's conception was not so rich. But from another viewpoint, that was also shared by Bonaventure and all those who, during the bitter controversies of the schools in the Xiith century, believed themselves to be defending the very centre of the spiritual life against Thomism; Augustinian illuminism transcended natural contuition[4]. The reason they maintained this "divine" certitude of the first principles with such tenacity was because they considered that God shewed Himself to man in them and through them: intuition of the principles, they asserted, entails implicitly an indirect intuition of God; a natural "*contuition*", basis of faith and wisdom; the latter produces another in the supernatural order. All this, for St. Augustine, is implied by *divine illumination*. To his mind, the true, the only real illumination of man in this world is indubitably that which comes from faith and wisdom, God's work in the soul. But because "contuition" makes these possible and constitutes their remote preparation it also deserves the name of illumination; even though it should not transcend

1 *Contuition* is thus an *indirect,* "mediate", knowledge of God, conditioned by the special co-operation mentioned above. "This indirect apprehension by the mind of an object that escapes us, but whose presence is in some way implied in that of the effects that derive from it, is given the name of *contuitus* in St. Bonaventure's teaching". E. G1I.S0N, *op. cit.*, p. 385. Cf. *In Hexaem,* V' 33···

2 Fr. Bissen speaks in the same way as M. Gilson of St. Bonaventure's special illuminism, i. e., he takes it to mean a *special natural co-operation of* an *intellectual* nature: this co-operation is the work of God *as exemplary cause,* differing from general co-operation, the work of God as efficient cause, and the help given to the will, the work of God as final cause. *Op. cit.,* p. 241. On this question, see the whole of the nnd Part, *De Γinfluence exemplaire de Dieu,* p. 155 sq. Apart from this "special co-operation", *illumination* may be termed *¡pedal* liecause of the particular nature of the effect produced and the special purposes for which it is used by God, purposes that are known to the theologian and fondly considered by the mystic. Saint Augustine's texts imply nothing more; but they justify, and even call for philosophical precision. Such, however, even though thoroughly Augustinian in tone, would have been given second place by Augustine.

3 The whole of E. Gilson's work is opposed to such a reduction.

4 See John Peckham's letters. Cf. E. PORTALIÉ, Augustinisme, in *Diet, theol.,* col. 2508. There is no doubt that St. Bonaventure not only approved but even furthered the opposition to Thomism.

the universal natural co-operation, it is nevertheless a very special work of divine providence[x]. The simple natural manifestation of truth in the mind by intuition of the first principles is a *special illumination* for those who consider these principles *inasmuch* as they constitute the image of God in the soul and render it capable of receiving his supernatural image through wisdom[1]. Thus conceived, illumination may be embodied in a theological and mystical teaching and it was this that gave it such importance for the Augustinians and in particular for St. Bonaventure[34]

C) Theology.

A theology based on such a philosophical system was bound to be original, as may be seen from the following characteristic theses.

I. The existence of God is a truth which, for St. Bonaventure, has no need of demonstration in the true sense of the word. In reality, of the *three ways* that he indicates for the attainment of God, the first is a direct observation rather than a proof : our natural desire for wisdom, happiness and peace implies the knowledge of God. The latter is as much "innate" as are the principles : its cause is to be found in the soul's close resemblance to God[4] and is "implied" in the deepest and noblest aspirations of our soul. These psychological data might have been utilised as a basis for the *second way,* causality; but St. Bonaventure preferred

[1] This is applicable, *a fortiori,* to the Bonaventuran concept of a special natural co-operation. It should be remarked however, that many authors, including M. de Wulf, understand St. Bonaventure's natural illumination in the sense of a simple general co-operation as taught by St. Thomas. *Hist. phil. vi¿d.y* il, p. 352.

[2] See our study *La contuition et la vision médiate de Dieu d'après S. Augustin,* in *Ephemerides lheolog. lovan.,* 1929, p. 23-39, 205-229. St. Augustine did not derive his doctrine of illumination from philosophy : his theology of faith and wisdom led him to his conception of natural illumination, which, of course, makes use of the Platonic theory of ideas.

[3] St. Thomas retains the essentials of this doctrine (see p. 572). The Augustinians were wrongly led to believe that he imperilled it by his method, since he clearly distinguished, with a scientific end in view, the natural from the scientific order (see p. 572) and developed his doctrine according to a purely rational and dialectic processus (see p. 576).

[4] "The soul, as we have said, has a natural aptitude for knowing all things, since it is able to reflect them. We may now add that it possesses a very special aptitude for knowing God by reflection, since it is made in His own image and likeness. In the profound harmony between these tw'o intelligible essences, ut ykhich one is the cause and the archetype of the other, our innate knowledge of God s existence takes root . E. Gilson, *op. cit.*. p, 124-125.

to rely on sensible data, though he made no particular discrimination among these nor classified them as did St. Thomas. What is essential, is the principle of the intelligible order in which the knowledge of God is already implicitly found; contingent and imperfect being does not give us this knowledge but rather confirms its previous existence in the mind [1]. In the third way in which God is sought in *the very idea of God,* we find on the contrary an explicit knowledge founded on the foregoing, but developed by reflection, argument and faith. Produced by the spiritual forces that control our intellectual faculties, our idea of the Perfect Being establishes its existence, for existence pertains to the essence of the Perfect Being[2].

Based on such psychological premisses, St. Anselm's argument comes into its own [3]. St. Bonaventure's three ways, logically complementary one of the other, gradually lead the mind to an ever clearer idea of God [4]. Faith renders these rational data complete by confirming them [5]; especially does it bring new truths, of which the greatest is naturally the existence of three Persons in God.

2. The Trinity is one of the mysteries that held a special attraction for St. Bonaventure[6]. ITe wrote of it at length in the *Commentary,* discussing the possible nature of generation and the engendered in God, and the spiration of love, which is the Spiritus amoris[7]. In the *Itinerarium*[0] he also treats of the mystery. In the third chapter he likens the three faculties of man to the Trinity, and indicates other symbols of a different nature. From a Trinitarian viewpoint, however, the most remarkable passage of the book is the sixth chapter in which the Seraphic Doctor attempts to

[1] This tendency to simplify does not, however, exclude demonstration nor the part played by sensible reality and causality.

[2] Did it not exist, our intellectual life would be non-existent. The principle of causality is implicit here. — [3] [4] See above p. 410.

[4] E. Gilson pertinently observes that St. Bonaventure's teaching of the implicit knowledge of God cannot be absolutely compared with that of St. Thomas: for the former, a previously formed virtuality is in question, while the latter speaks of an indetermination that awaits an objective complement. *Op. tit.,* n. 133-138. This divergence, however, though important for the philosopher, is less so in theology and the spiritual life, since St. Bonaventure's virtual knowledge facilitates rather then impedes rational demonstration and instead of excluding faith, finds in it a complete explanation.

[5] Wisdom brings it to perfection. Sec p. 521.

[6] See Th. de Régnon, *op. cit.* — [1] *Op. omnia,* vol. I, p. 40 sq.

[8] See below, p. 521-522.

furnish a deeper understanding of the mystery, by making use of the dictum of Dionysius the Areopagite : *Bonum est diffusivum sui*[1]. In spite of appearances, this is not, as some have thought, a real endeavour to demonstrate rationally the revealed dogma. St. Bonaventure was well aware that the mystery cannot be absolutely proved by reason and that our knowledge of God is merely analogical.

3. With regard to the purpose of the Incarnation, St. Bonaventure differs from Alexander of Hales and Albert the Great. The latter thought that God had decreed it by reason of its intrinsic perfection, apart from the Fall. This opinion was adopted by Duns Scotus and subsequently by the entire Franciscan Order. Like St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure believes that the Redemption is the main purpose of Christ's coming. He was nevertheless aware of the good points in the contrary opinion[2]. As a true son of St. Francis he did a great deal to foster the devotion to the Passion of Our Lord, notably in the *Lignum vites*[3].

4. St. Bonaventure had a tender devotion for Our Lady. She is the subject of 27 sermons. The pious doctor exalted all her privileges, particularly her exemption from all fault, and her prenatal sanctification. He did not, however, concede the *immaculate conception* since the Saviour alone is excepted by the law that St. Paul states : " Omnes in Adam peccaverunt"[4]. The Franciscan Order amended this point of his teaching and one of its greatest glories is to have achieved the triumph of the true doctrine.

5. The sacramentary doctrine[5] explained in the ivth book of his Commentary of Peter Lombard's Sentences, about 1248, contains opinions that have had but few adherents, regarding the *institution oj the sacraments* and the efficacy of the sacrament of penance. He gave a more exact notion of the efficacy of the sacraments in general in book in. To his mind, they are not simple conditions of grace, but true causes (efficiunt quod significant). Without formulating a definite opinion on the nature of this causality he tends to regard it as either moral or dispositive (non quia gratiam donent, sed quia *efficacem ordinationem* habent, divina pactione, ad gratiam) ; and elsewhere : " Gratia oritur ex fonte æterno et *ab* illo *hauritur {transitar,* Quaraechi ed.) ab ipsa anima *in* ipsis sacramentis".

6. The grace that is given to us by Christ in the sacraments, is the Holy Ghost Himself, the Gift pre-eminent,

[1] See below, p. 524.

[2] It may even be said that he was in a measure responsible for the adoption of this pious teaching within the Order. See below, p. 524. A special point of Bonaventure's Christology is that Christ possessed infused knowledge *per se.* See J. Bittremieux in *Eludesfranc.,* 1922, p. 308-326. — [3] See below, p. 524.

[4] Anima enim Virginis ex sui unione ad illam carnem peccatum originale contraxit. *In II'Sent* bk. III, D. lit q. i. Cf. X. Lf. Bachelet, *I„„».* tn *DutthM.,* coi. 1049. J Bittremieux, in *Eludes franc.,* 192S, p. 367-391. — ¡J. Bittremieux, *M,* 1923, p. 129.152, 225.240, 337-355

and also a created reality that takes form in the soulr, and which derives from the Holy Ghost as the light comes from the sun. St. Bonaventure is fond of comparing with light the grace that makes us like to God. He considers that it is inherent not in the substance of the soul alone, but in the substance together with its faculties[2]. Grace is a likeness to God and is received by the soul, the natural image of God, for the purpose of a greater and supernatural assimilation to God, and finally, for union with Him. Its first effect is to justify man and make him pleasing to God; hence the name *gratia gratum faciens* usually given to sanctifying grace[3]. Its function is to restore to man in this world, at least some measure of the perfect righteousness he has lost through sin and which was characterised by the easy accomplishment of the noblest activities of the soul; those which on the one hand control the whole of man, and on the other effectively submit him to God. A true ordination of the faculties should thus be established in order to produce actions that will become more and more perfect: these may be termed, first, intermediary, and final. On this basis, in the order of supernatural knowledge we may distinguish *credere, intelligere, videre intellecta.* In order to set up this hierarchy both in the faculties and their actions, grace must be diversified in *virtues* that rectify, *gifts* that excite and *beatitudes* that make perfect[4].

Saint Bonaventure connects the mystical graces with the gifts, especially with that of wisdom, with regard to what is essential in them, particularly that "experimental knowledge of God"[5] or contemplation. "The gift of wisdom concerns the knowledge of supernatural truths according to eternal reasons, but inasmuch as these reasons lead to the taste and experience of the divine suavity"[6]. The last chapter of the *Itinerarium* magnificently describes this contemplation considered

[1] *In II Sent.,* I), xxxi, a. r, q. 1-3. St. Bonaventure thus differs from Lombard on this point. See above, p. 460.

[3] Which, in his teaching, arc not so clearly distinguished from the soul's essence as in St. Thomas. The same is to be said of sanctifying grace and the virtues.

[2] St. Bonaventure gives to actual grace the name of *gratia gratis data (In II Sent.,* D. xxvm, a. 2, q. 1), an expression that also meansan exceptional grace given for the benefit of others. The expression actual grace is current mainly from the time of the Council of Trent, and was little used by the scholastics; they paid more attention to sanctifying grace, unlike St. Augustine. St. Thomas prefers the expression *motio, auxilium.*

[4] See *Rreviloq.,* V, c. iv. Gifts and beatitudes thus characterise perfection, produced by the former and constituted or manifested by the latter.

[5] *In III Sent.,* D. XXXV, a. ï, q. I, conci. — [6] *Ibid.,* q. 3, ad im.

in its most perfect expression. It is, of course, inferior to the beatific vision[1] since the divine essence cannot be perceived in this life[2]. But it is superior to the most profound knowledge of God that may be obtained in the ordinary human way; not only that which rises to him through sensible data and the spiritual soul, but also that which proceeds from the transcendent ideas of truth and goodness[3] for in all these modes human activity preponderates. Though it is not denied that God in contemplation *(contuitus)* is *seen with* the first ideas that constitute the light of the mind, He is seen independently of our reflective operations, by means of the activity of the Holy Ghost Who arrests all human operation; raising man in an ineffable manner above himself, the Holy Ghost brings him into contact with God. Here we must speak of taste, of experience and touch rather than of vision in the true meaning of the term. Knowledge certainly plays some little part[4] for at the outset the act of wisdom is intellectual before achieving its end in feeling and a certain savouring. This is the essence of contemplation[5]. That which St. Bonaventure describes is wholly passive and infused. He terms it *excessus,* a kind of ecstasy, which however, he regards in no way as extraordinary[6]. He describes only the essential act, not perhaps in its highest but certainly in its most absorbing manifestation[7]; he was nevertheless aware that wisdom may act within the soul in a less superhuman manner, first in the saints, apart from these moments of intense grace, and also in virtuous souls who prepare themselves for it, according to the counsel of the blessed doctor who imposes on them this preparation. It will be obvious that all his ascetic teaching and even his moral theology find their justification in his mysticism.

7. The Bonaventuran moral teaching finds its natural starting point in the innate aspirations of the soul towards good, aspirations that reflect the divine ideas and guide man towards his end. The moral virtues are already there in germ and may be developed by use. They[1] are nevertheless still entirely natural, imperfect, and incapable of meriting before the infusion of grace and the *theological virtues*[8].

[1] Although these acts are termed beatitudes.

[2] With the exception of a most extraordinary favour, vouchsafed perhaps to St. Paul. — [3] Cf. chaps, i-vi of the *Itinerarium.* See below, p. 523-524.

[4] A relative light, not without its obscurity from other standpoints. *Itiner.,* vu.

[5] *In II Sent.,* D. XXXV, a. I, q. 1, conci. St. Thomas says, on the contrary, that the act of the gift of wisdom "causam quidem habet in voluntate, scilicet caritatem, sed essentiam habet in intellectu". *Sum. théol.,* q. 45, a. 2. St. Thomas apparently speaks from a philosophical standpoint, while St. Bonaventure bases himself on experimental data.

[6] Not only does he not consider it rash to aspire thereto, but as a true son of St. Francis he encourages fervent souls to achieve it. See E. Gilson, *op. at.,* p. 69-88.

[7] For St. Theresa, the highest manifestation of wisdom, in the Vllth Mansion, does not usually occur with such vehemence.

[8] Charity according to St. Bonaventure, cf. J. Kaup, *Die theol. Tugend der Liebe,...* Munster, 1927.

The purpose of the latter is first to fortify what is noblest in the soul and then to restore the image of the Blessed Trinity, thus achieving a true union with God. From the moral viewpoint their function is threefold : to hasten the formation of virtuous habits, should they not exist; to animate the supernaturally existing natural habits; to allow the accomplishment of perfect acts. There are four fundamental (cardinal) *inorai virtues,* to which all the others may be reduced[1]. Their purpose is to rectify the soul and with the help of the gifts lead it to moral perfection in its acts. This, however, can be achieved only through a gradual advance in three stages, or *three ways.* St. Bonaventure definitively accustomed the West to the expressions of the Areopagite, *(purgatio, illuminatio, perfectio)*[2] though he gave them a very marked ascetic meanings[3]. In this life the goal of this moral progression is the *contemplative life* whose essential act we have mentioned above. Among the means of attainment most recommended by St. Bonaventure we may indicate renunciation, the practice of virtue, devotion to Christ, prayer in general and also study[4]. He also conceived a special exercise, truly Augustinian and characteristic of his method. These are the *elevations.*

These elevations, modelled on those of the School of St. Victor[5] are described in the *Itinerarium.* St. Bonaventure gives us a well-thought out plan of subjects for meditation rather than mere models. These pious studies are developed in *three stages,* promoting an ever growing spiritual activity in the soul and thus disposing it to receive the wholly spiritual impression of the Holy Ghost. The soul should first consider sensible realities before going on to an examination of its own intellectual and supernatural interior life; lastly it should pause at those primary ideas that provide us with the essential names of God, Truth and Good. At this point St. Bonaventure combines bold speculation with an *advanced ascetic method* \n order to lead souls by means of a kind of active contemplation to the gates of an indubitable infused contemplation[6]* These speculations imply that St. Bonaventure possessed a very special enlightenment, a fruit of wisdom, and it is possible that they can be understood only by those who read them in the same spirit; they are meant for very advanced souls. They belong to a kind of superior speculation of which we shall speak below.

1 *In III Sent.,* D. 33, a. I, q. 4. — 2 See P. Pourrat, *op. cit.*

3 A meaning somewhat at variance from that of Dionysius the Areopagite. See above, p. 94.

4 See E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 82 sq. — 5 See above, p. 454.

6 St. John of the Cross favours another method. See below, p. 830. There is no radical opposition between the two teachings, but rather two parallel methods.

D) Contemplative theology or mystical philosophy.

1. We give this name to doctrinal explanations of a higher order, mystical not only by their tendency[1] but also by their very object; not in the sense that mystical graces are here studied theoretically[2] but because they are copiously used in the teaching that is developed. It is a doctrine familiar mainly to divinely taught minds who possess an eminent idea of God[3] and are capable of applying it to the most diverse objects in order to judge them in the light of God. This superior penetration gives rise to admirable *syntheses of a* complex nature in which both philosophical and theological elements find a place[4]. A greater effort is made to unite rather than to distinguish, in order to subject all things to God and thus lead souls to Him in every possible way. The spirit and method of St. Bonaventure is very manifest in this, while the qualities that distinguish him from St. Thomas are very clearly marked. This may be seen from a simple analysis of the *Itinerarium*, a work of but a few pages, whose contents give it capital importance and marvellously reveal the method and genius of its author[5].

2. The purpose of the Itinerarium mentis ad Deum, says the author in his *Prologue*, is to teach various exercises apt to uplift souls to God. These exercises are called indiscriminately elevations *(ascensiones)*[6], or illuminations *(illuminationum suspensiones)*[7] or speculations *(speculationes)*. The mind, should it choose, can take a large part in these studies, but Bonaventure warns the reader that "it is not enough that reading be without unction, reflection without devotion, seeking without admiration, deep attention without joy of the heart, skill without piety, knowledge without charity, understanding without humility,

[1] See above, p. 507.

[3] The meaning now given to the expression: *Mystical Theology*. See vol. I, p. 19. — [3] [4] Due to contemplation. See vol. I, p. 22 sq.

[4] There is here no confusion of the natural and supernatural orders as has sometimes been thought.

[5] The ontologist interpretation of this work derives from the fact that its ascetic, philosophical and theological teaching has not been retained in its strictly mystical background.

[6] Aliquas mentales ascensiones in Deum.

[7] Sex illuminationum suspensiones, quibus anima quasi quibusdam gradibus et itineribus disponitur ut transeat ad pacem, per ecstaticos excessus sapientix chnstian.v.

application without grace, *light without the inspiration of divine wisdom* ", The six elevations may be grouped two by two according to whether the starting point of these reflections is of a sensible (ch. 1-2), psychological (ch. 3-4) or metaphysical nature (ch. 5-6).

zz) Elevations in the sensible order (ch. 1-2).

Chapter I. Having indicated in the first part of this chapter the moral and supernatural conditions *of* these exercises, Bonaventure goes on to show that the five senses—windows giving on to the outside world—reveal to the soul the divine power, goodness and beauty of creation, especially if the beginning and the end, the greatness, the number, beauty, plenitude, activity and order of created things is considered.

Chapter 11. *Knowledge of* the outside world by means of a *sensible image,* of which the very perception is a pleasure and which we interpret in the light of unchangeable laws, should lift us up to God, Who produces an *Image* (His Word) which in His turn joins Himself to us in order to lead us to the Father, our God, in Whom alone is our *joy:* God the Eternal *Truth,* in Whose light we judge the operations of our senses and reach truth.

b) Elevations in the psychological order (ch. 3 and 4).

Chapter hi. *The three principal natural faculties of the soul* (memory, intellect, will) express in us some aspect of God : *a) memory* reminds us of His eternity and also of his presence (since the primary jrinciples, immediate object *of* the memory, are derived directly rom God); *b)* the *intellect* is unable to from any *perfect definition* without knowing what is the "ens per se"; this entails a knowledge of unity, truth and good and in consequence the need of divine help*. *c}* The *will* cannot even move towards its object, if a knowledge of the Sovereign[2] Good is not impressed on the soul, for lacking- such knowledge, the soul can neither decide on its duty, nor judge with certainty, nor vehemently desire the good. All this reveals how "near" the soul is to God and how apt for union with Him[3]. In addition, these three faculties together form a *symbol of the Trinity.* Other symbols arc found by the author in philosophy and each of its branches.

Chapter iv. When the soul has become a perfect image of God, through the grace of Christ, Who by means of the full development of the *theological virtues* rectifies all the natural powers, it is able to contemplate God within itself. Moral rectitude (purification, illumination, perfection) obtained for the soul through faith, hope, and charity, gives it the full possession of truth in an admirable union with God.

[1] Non venit intellectus noster ut *plene* resolvens intellectum alicujus entium creatorum, nisi juvetur ab intellectu entis purissimi, actualissimi, completissimi et absoluti. Sec above, p. 514.

[2] Impressa notitia Summi Boni. See above, p. 513.

[3] Sensible images, says the author, hinder the soul from penetrating its own faslnessess *(adse),* and hence he concludes to the necessity (congruence) of the Incarnate Truth, without Whose grace, the soul is unable "ab hiS sensibilibus revelari ad contuitum sui et æternæ veritatis in seipsa ". See above, p. 514 sq.

The scriptures show that in the soul thus renewed by Christ, all things are in harmony (hierarchical, says Dionysius). A new and splendid description of the union with God brings the chapter to its close.

c) Elevations to God in the metaphysical order (ch. 5-6).

Chapter v. The soul contemplates God in the *idea oj being.* Here, symbolic theology is left aside and we enter upon theology in the true sense of the term (ch. 1). In this order we know God not in His creation or the soul that is His image, but " per lumen quod est *signatum* supra mentem nostram ", and since our mind is immediately informed by truth itself (cum ipsa mens nostra immediate ab ipsa veritate formetur), this light that is impressed on us may be called "lumen veritatis æternæ" (not "veritas æterna"). This light is the *being* that has to be considered and of which a very comprehensive idea must be formed : "Contemplans videt ipsum esse adeo in se certissimum quod non potest cogitari non esse". All the *attributes* of the divine essence may thus be found in the light of the eternal truth.

Chapter vi. Finally, meditation on the *Trinity* is made possible by the *idea of Good.* Bonaventure postulates as evident that the idea of Good implies those of *being* and *truth* which are logically anterior. He defines the sovereign good as " Bonum quo nihil melius cogitari nequit" and affirms that it can be conceived only as simultaneously *one* and *three.* Indeed the very idea of good supposes its communicability, and this, if it is to be perfect, must be the gift of the whole self (nature) to a principle equal to the self (person) by means of generation (Word) and spiration (Love). From these premisses, Bonaventure draws the relations of the Persons to one another and examines their relations with the man in Jesus Christ.

With chapter VII the elevations in a strict sense terminate : The soul has come to the highest knowledge it can acquire through its divinely aided activities. A still higher knowledge is possible, but this pertains to another order, described above (p. 519 sq.). The purpose of the exercises that are described here is to prepare the latter.

3. Christ forms one of the main objects of St. Bonaventure's mystical thought. Although the Seraphic Doctor did not explicity maintain the opinion regarding the main purpose of the Incarnation that was adopted by the whole Franciscan Order after Duns Scotus, he certainly sowed the seed by the place he gave to Our Lord in his speculation. He liked to think of Him as the *centre of the universe:* centre of the divine life as Word, He becomes the centre of the world by His Incarnation; angels as well as men see in him their Head and history revolves around Him. He is made the "centre" by His entire person and even by His Cross, since from Calvary and the Cross radiates the supernatural light of which He is the source [1]. Especially

[1] See these various viewpoints, mentioned by E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 453-456.

is He the fount of all wisdom and all knowledge :1 this forms one of Bonaventure's fundamental ideas and the achievment of his exemplarism.

4. Therefore a mystical philosophy, greater than ordinary philosophy, finding in faith a wider outlook, imposes itself on the Christian who knows what God is, and who desires to see all things in the light of God and revelation. This is the philosophy that underlies all Bonaventure's writings and is explained in many of his opuscula : he looks upon it as the necessary complement of Christian thought. Judged in lie light of wisdom, theology appears to him not only as the greatest of the sciences on account of its object, but the only one capable of guiding human speculation2. To his mind the whole of naturels meant to further the divine plan for the union of man with God; hence a profusion of analogies that have their source in exemplarism. The soul also constitutes a veritable world in which all things are ordered in various ways according to a system of subtle relationships that St. Bonaventure is never tired of explaining. The rule of threefold division provoked his fertile mind to ingenious classifications3. The very abundance of such a philosophy might constitute a danger were it not guarded against by a reliance on the certain data of nature and faith. Any likelihood of confusing the two orders is avoided by remembering that these high and mystical notions form an applied4 5 theology rather than a true philosophy' and far from excluding a purely rational study of nature they' suppose and demand it, just as the spiritual interpretations of the Bible must be based on a sound literal interpretation of the sacred text.

In every domain and every stage of thought, the mind of St. Bonaventure reaches out to God, and also, it has been remarked, to contemplation and ecstasy. Compared with him, St. Thomas, despite his burning love, thinks only of considering things in themselves, certain that God is to be found if the mind remains ever faithful to truth. These two mentalities are certainly not incompatibles; but at the outset the contrast stood out with greater

1 See especially the *In Hexaemeron,* the *De scientia Christi* (q. iv), rhe *Itinerarium* (ch. iv)j etc. Cf. J.-M. Bissen, *op. cit.,* p. 176.

3Cf. *In Hexaemeron, De reductione ;* etc.

3See examples in E. Gilson, *op. cit.,* p. 366, 435, 436.

4 See p. 507.

5 The philosophical study of nature *in* itself (not *por* itself) such as was conceived by St. Thomas, would seem to be the indispensable introduction to that more complex study that places nature in a supernatural ambitus, such as was practised by St. Bonaventure. The first and more positive method does not, as has been said, exclude wisdom, if it remains faithful to truth; wisdom, considered objectively, is comprised therein, at least implicitly, and there is no reason to suppose that the supernatural gift of wisdom does not interiorly guide the doctor who seeks it for the greater good of the Church, as was the case for St. Thomas.

sharpness. St. Bonaventure was too engossed in his own viewpoint to see all the vaine of that of St. Thomas. For this reason he permitted his religious, notably at Paris, to resist the Dominican master, and thus ran the risk of appearing as the leader of the opposition. His bearing, however, was so discreet and prudent, that all tradition, leaving aside their divergences, has held up to posterity the friendship that united the Seraphic Doctor and the Angelic Doctor and has admired the agreement of their common genius and their saintly souls in the quest for unalloyed truth, inspired by one and the same wisdom.

CHAPTER X.

Saint Thomas Aquinas.

Special bibliography :[1]

1. Editions of the Complete Works : A. *Early edits :* among these, the most famous is that by Pius V, Rome, 1570; the others are those of \zenice (1592), Antwerp (1612), Paris, 1660), Rome-Padua (1666-1698), Venice, annotated by De Rubeis (1745). B· *Recent edits:* in the 19th century all the works were re-edited at Parma, in 25 vols (1852-1873) and at Paris (Vives) in 34 vols (1871-1880; 2nd edit., 1889-1890). The new critical edition, undertaken on the instance of Leo XIII *(Leonineedition)y* will take the place of all others when it is complete: it already comprises 14 vols (1882-1926): Aristotle's commentaries, vol. 1-3; Summa theologica, vol. iv-Xll ; Sum. contra Gentiles, vol. XIII-XIV. Títere exist innumerable special editions of the *Sumina theologica :* Naples (1848), Bologna (1853-61), Parma (1852-57), Turin (1885), Rome (1886-87) and particularly Paris: 1841-45 (Migne), 1856 (Blond), 1864 (Vivès), 1887-1889 (Lethielleux), and another by Blot, in course of publication.

Translations: English translation of the *Summa theologica* by the Dominican Fathers, Part. I, cp 1-26 (1920) q. 27-49 (1921), cI· 103-119 (1922); Part II, q. 1-46 (1917); Part III, q. 1-26 (1913) q. 27-59 (19'4)«

2. Biographies. The *early sources* are mainly the three biographies by William of Tocco, Bernard Gui (Guidonis) and Peter Calo (re-edit. D. Prummer, O. P., Toulouse, 1911). A. TOURON, *La vie de S. Th.*

[1] This list should suffice for the scope of the present work. A fuller list of recent studies of all kinds may be found in the *Bibliographie t/l0miste* by Ff. Maxdoxxet and Destre/., Kain, 1921 (2219 items) and for later studies, the *Bulletin thomiste,* appearing as a supplement to the *Revue thomiste* since 1924.

tfAq., avec un exposé de sa doctrine et de ses ouvrages, Paris 1737. J. DlDIOT, 5. *Thomas d'Aq.,* Paris, 1874. J. V. De Groot, *Het leven v.d.h. Thomas,* 1882. Ch. Joyau, *S. Thomas d'Aq., Patron des Ecoles calli.,* Poitiers, 1886. J. A. En DRES, *Thomas v. Aq.,* Mainz, 1910, H. PETITOT, S. *Th. d'Aq., vocation, œuvres, vie spirituelle,* Paris, 1923. Vaughan, *Life and Labours of St. Thomas Aquinas,* 2 vols, London 1871-72: abridged in one vol., 1875. Conway, *St. Thomas Aquinas* (London and New York 1911). P. Man DONnet, *Chronologie wmmaire,* in *Rev. Sc. phil. théol.,* 1920, (vol. IX), p. 142-152; *Date de naissance de S. Thomas.,* in *Revue thomiste,* 1914, p. 652-692; *Thomas d'Aq. novice Prêcheur, in Revue thorn.,* 1924-1925 (7 articles).

3.General character and method. M. de Rubeis, *De gestis el scriptis ac doctrina S. Thonice A. dissertationes criUcce et apologetica,* Venice, 1750(111 the Leonine edit., I, p. LV-CCCXLVI, 1882). J. Gardair, *La raison et tafoi d'après S. Thomas d'Aq.,* Paris *(Ann. ph. chr.),* 1896. A. CardeïL, *La crédibilité et l'Apologétique,* Paris, 1908; *Le donné révéléet la théologie,* Paris, 1910; *La structure de l'âme et Γexpérience mystique,* Paris, 1927 (these three works form a series of studies on the "Method of theological sciences" according to St. Thomas : cf. preface of the latter). P. Rousselot, *L'intellectualisme de S. Th.,* Paris, 1908. Th. Heitz, *Essai historique sur les rapports entre ta philos, et lafoi,* Paris, 1909. H. DEHOVE, *Essai critique sur le réalisme thomiste comparéà l'idéalisme Kantien,* Lille, 1907. M. Grabmann, *Th. von Aq., Eine Einfiihrung in seine Persbnlichkeit und Gedankenwelt,* Munich, 1912. Th. Pegues, *Initiation thomiste,* Paris, 1921. A. Legendre, *Introd. à l'étude de la Som. th. de S. Th. d'Aq.,* Paris, 1923. Sources (as yet little studied): J. DURANTEL, *S'. Th. dAq. et le Pseudo-Denys,* Paris, 1919. A. Gard EIL, in *Rev. thom.,* 1903, p. 197-215 (St. Thomas' documentation). G. Bardy in *Rev. sc. ph. théol.,* 1923, p. 493-502 (Greek sources of the Ia).

4.General doctrinal outlines. (Concerning tke Summa theol.), The great commentators will be studied below, cf. Part. II, ch. m-iv, *Introductions* to the Summa : John OF St. Thomas, *Isagoge* (Fr. trans., La VAUD, Paris, 1928, with notes and appendix on the author). J. J. Berthler, *Détude de la Somme th. de S. Thomas,* Freiburg, 1893 (Paris, 1905); *Tabuler synopticce,* Freiburg, 1893. M· Grabmann, *Einjiihrung in die S. theol. desiti. Th. v. Aq.,* Freiburg im B., 1919. The last principal literal commentaries are those of R. BlLLUART, O. P., *Summa S. Thoma,* Liege, 1746-1751 (19 vols.) and 1759 (posthumous supplement, 20th vol.), and of Th. PÈGUES, O. P., *Commentaire franq. littéral de la S. th. de S. Thom. d'Aq.,* Toulouse, 1907-1928, 18 vols published. Briefer and more personal are the commentaries of L. Billot, S. J., Rome, 1892 sq. 12 vols (re-editions); L. Janssens, O. S. B., Freiburg, 1899 sq. (11 vols); F. Satolli, Rome, 1884-1888 (5 vols); LA. Paquet, Quebec, 1893-1903 (6 vols); A. Lépicier, Paris, 1902 sq. (il vols). Many summaries "ad mentem Sii Thomæ".

5.Philosophy. Innumerable text books. More general studies : A. FaRGES, *Etudes philosophiques pour vulgariser les théories d'Aristote et de S. Thomas et leur accord avec les sciences,* Paris, 1885-1907 (9 vols). D. Mercier-D. Nys, *Cours de philosophie,* Louvain 1894 sq., 7 vols (re-ed.), A. D. Sertillanges, S. *Thomas d'Aq.,* Paris, 1910 (2 vols).

Introductions to Thomist philosophy : P. Geny S. J., *Questions d'enseignement de la philosophie scolastique,* Paris, 1913. H. Petitot *Introduction à la philos, traditionnelle ou classique,* Paris, 1914' E. Gilson, *Le thomisme. Introduction au système de S. Thomas,* Strasburg, 1920 (2nd ed., Paris, 1923). E. Hugon, *Les XXIV thèses thomistes,* Paris, 1922 (2nd ed.). Th. PÈGUES, *Aperçus de philosophie thomiste et de propédeutique,* Paris, 1927. E. DE Brüyne, *La philosophie de S. Thomas,* Paris, 1928. A great deal of general philosophical data in R. GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, *Dieu, son existence et sa nature,* Paris, 1915 (4th ed. 1924) ; *Le sens commun,* Paris, 1909 (3rd cd., 1922), Short synthesis in M. DE WULF, *Hist, de la phil. médiévale,* 5th ed., II, P· I*33· See also J. Maritain, *Art et scolastique,* Paris, 1920; various articles.

6.Apologetics. In addition to the above work by Fr. Gardeil, *Crédibilité et apologétique,* Paris, 1908, see A. D. SERTILLANGES, *La source de la croyance en Dieu,* Paris, 1906. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *De revelatione supernaturali, secundum SU Thoma doctrinam,* Paris, 1917. J. V. DE Gr OOT, *Summa apologetica de Ecclesia cath. ad mentem Sti Thoma,* Ratisbon, 1890. L. de Grandmaison, S. J., *Eapologétique de S. Thomas,* 1907, in the *Nouv. Rev. théol.,* and the *Bull. Litt. eccl.* P. Broch, *Santo Tomás y la sistematisación apologetica,* in *Ciencia Tomista,* 1920 (xxi\ p. 5-14, 193-214. See also diverse articles on the *Summa contra Gentiles:* G. Grain, *Modernidad de la Summa contra gentiles,* in *Ciencia Tom.,* 1919, p. 196-209; 1920, p. 13-66. L. Getino, *La Summa contra Gentes y el Pugio fidei,* Vergara, 1905. Cf. E. Petronius, *In summam catholica fidei C. G., S. Thoma elucidationes,* Naples, i885 (4 vols in fol.). Special matters: F. Tessen Wesierski, *Die Grundlagen des Wunderbegriffes nach Th. v. Aq.,* Paderborn, 1899. A. VAN Hove, *La doct. du miracle chez S. Thomas,* Paris, 1927. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *La grace de la poi et le miracle,* in *Rev. thorn.,* 1918, p. 289-320; see ibid., 1919, p. 193-213. P. Rousselot and J. Huby, in *Rech. sc. relig.,* 1910, 1913, 1918.

7.Natural and supernatural Providence : the question on which the *Thomist theses* differ specifically from Molinism : see the great 16th century commentators (p. 742). Their interpretation, maintained by A. MassouliÉ, *O. P., Divus Thomas sui interpres, de divina motione et libertate creata* (2 vols, Paris, 1692) is explained at length by Fr. del Prado, O. P., *De gratia et libero arbitrio,* 3 vols, Freiburg 1907. The numerous treatises written against the modern defenders of Molinism (See *Molina,* p. 763) contain almost the same teaching : R. Beaudoin, O. P., *De la prémotion physique de S. Th.* (Reply to Fr. Mazella), 1879. A· M· DUMMERMUTH, O. P., S. *Th. et doctrina pramotionis physica* (Reply to Fr. Schneemann), Louvain, 1886; *Defensio doctrina S. Thoma de pramotione physica* (reply to Fr. Frins), Louvain, 189'5. J. J. Berthier, *Le néo-molinisme et le paléo-thomisme, à propos d'un livre du R. P. Frins,* in *Rev. thorn.,* 1893 (1), 3 articles. See also, *ibid.,* articles by H. Guillermin, O. P., Ò'. *Th. et le prédéterminisme,* 1895-1896; A. VlLLARD, O. P., *La providence,* 1896-1897. H. GayrAUD, O. P., *Le thomisme et le molinisme,* Paris, 1889 and 1890 (reply to Fr. De Régnon); *Providence et libre arbitre,* Paris, 1892; *S. Th. et le prédéterminisme,* Paris, 1895. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, S. *1 liornas et le néo-molinisme,* 5th appendix

to his book on God, 4th ed., Paris, 1923. Moderate exposition of Thomism by H. GUILLERMIN, O. P., *La grâce suffisante,* in *Rev. thorn.,* 1901-1903, 5 articles. New angle on Thomism by Card. Jos. Pecci, 5. *Tommaso circa l'influsso divino e la scienza mezza,* Rome, 1885 (criticised by H. GUILLERMIN, O. P., in *Ann. phil. chr.,* 1886). This Neo-Thomism was also maintained by Satolli, Paquet, and Lepicier (cf. n° 4). A certain modern Molinism also purports to be a wide interpretation of St. Thomas.

8. Various questions of Dogmatic Theology. On the Trinity. Th. de Régnon, *Etudes de théol. positive,* vol. ll (1892), p. 133-232. On angels, A. Vacant, in *Diet, théol.,* 1903,00!. 1228-1248. On man, J. B. KORS, O. P., *La justice primitive et le péché originel d'après S. Thomas,* Kain, 1922. J. B. TERRIEN, S. J., *S. Th. Aq. doctrina sincera de unione hypostatica,* Paris, 1894. A. Villard, O. P., *Eincarnation d'après S. Th. d'Aq.,* Paris, 1908. M. SCHWALM, O. P., *h Christ d'après S. Th.,* Paris, 1910. S. Szabo, O. P., *De scientia beata Christi,* in *Xenia thomistica,* li (1924), p. 349-491. F. BROMmer, *Die Lehre vont sakramentalen character in der Scholastik bis Th. v.Aq.,* Paderborn, 1908. M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre des hl. Th. v. Aq. von der Kirche als Gotleswerk,* Regensburg, 1903. Series of special studies (popular) : Hugon, *Le mystère de la Ste Trinité,* Paris, 1912; *Le mystère de l'Incarnation,* Paris, 1925 (5th); *Le mystère de la Rédemption,* P. 1910; *La Ste Eucharistie* P. 1917 (2nd); *Hors de i'Eglise point de salut,* P., 1907 ; *La causalité instrumentale...,* P., 1907. Oratorical and affective explanations of dogma: J. MonsabrÉ, *Exposition du dogme catholique,* Paris, 1869-1890. L. Bail, *Théologie affective selon S. Thomas,* or S. *Thomas en méditations,* 1654 re-ed., Chevereau, 1855 ; new ed. Bougal, 1904-6, 12 vols). G. Contenson, 0. P. (d. 1664), *Theologia mentis et cordis,* 1668.

9. Moral Subjects (natural and supernatural) : full development : M. A. Janvier, O. P., *L'Exposition de la morale catholique,* Paris, 1903-1924. A. D. Sertillanges, O. P., *La philosophic morale de S. Th. d'Aq.,* Paris, 1916. A. DE La BARRE, S. J., *La morale d'après S. Th. et les théologiens scolastiques.* Paris, 1911. R. Beaudoin, *Tractatus de conscientia,* Paris, 1911. Dom O. Lottin, *Loi morale naturelle et loi positive d'après S. Th. d'Aq.,* Louvain, 1920; *La vertu de religion d'après S. Th. d'Aq.,* Louvain, 1920; diverse other studies, 1922-1923. J. Gardair, *Phil.de S. Th. : Les vertus morales naturelles,* Paris, 1901. A. Gay, *L'honneur, sa place dans la morale,* Freiburg, 1913. A. Gardeil, series of articles in *Rev. thom.,* 1918-1919 (six art.). See the great commentaries mentioned, and the modern theological treatises based on St Thomas, especially, A. Tanquerey, *Synopsis theol. mor.,* Tournai, 1904 (re-ed.). D. PrümMER, O. P., *Manuale theol. mor.,* Freiburg, 1915. For moral philosophy see Card. Zigliara, *Summa philos.,* in, *jus naturale,* Rome, 1876. L. Lehu, O. P., *Philosophia moralis et socialis,* vol. I, *Ethica generalis,* Paris, 1914. H. D. NOBLE, *La conscience morale,* Paris, 1923 (2nd. ed). E. Gilson, S. *Thomas d'Aquin,* Coll. *Les moralistes chrétiens,* Paris, 1925. For social and political teaching see G. DE Pascal, *Philosophie morale et sociale,* 2 vols., Paris, 1894-1896. M. B. Schwalm, O. P., *Leçons de philosophie sociale,* 2 vols, Paris, 1911-1912. S. Deploige, *Le conflit de la morale et de la sociologie,* Louvain, 1911 (Paris, 1912). V. CaTHREIN, S. J.,

Das Jus gentium... beim hl. Th. v. Aq., Fulda, 1889. Political teaching: H. A. MONTAGNE, in *Rev. thorn.,* 1900-1902. *J.* ZEILLER, *Didêe de l'Etat dans S. Th.,* Paris, 1910. B. Roland-GOSSELIN, *La doct. poi. de S. Th.,* Paris, 1928.

10. **Spirituality** (ascetic and mystical). Th. de Valigornera, *Mystica theologia divi Thoma,* Barcelona, 1665 (J. Berthier's ed., Turin, 2 vols, 19ii). A. MaSSOULIÉ, *Pratique des vertus de S. 77/.,* Toulouse, 1685; *Meditations de S. Th. sur les trois voies,* Toulouse, 1678, (re-ed., Laurent, Paris, 1888) ; *Traité de la veritable oraison d'après les principes de S. Th.,* (J. Rousset's ed.), Paris, 1900. A. M. MeyNARD, O. P., *Traité de la vie int. Petite Soniinc de théol. ascétique et mystique d'après l'esprit et les principes de S. Th. dAq.,* Clermont, 1885 (2 vols) ; re-ed. G. Gcrest, Paris, 1925. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Perfection chrétienne et contemplation,* 2 vols, S. Maximin, 1923. D. JORET, *La contemplation mystique d'après S. Th. d'Aq.,* Lille, 1923.

11. **Miscellaneous subjects.** Authority of St. Thomas : Fr. MANDONNET, *Les titres doctoraux de S. Th. dAq.,* in *Rev. thorn.* 1909, p. 604. *La canonisation de S. Th. d'Aq.,* in *Mélanges thorn.,* p. 1-48. J. J. Berthier, O. P., 5. *Th. Doctor communis Ecclesice (testimonia Ecclesia),* Rome, 1914. L. Lavaud, S. 77/. "*guide des études",* Paris, 1925. Special articles· P. Mandonnet, *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 872-886. *Mélanges thomistes,* published by the Dominicans of the Province of Paris on the 6th cent, of St. Thomas' canonisation, Kain, 1923. *Xenia thomistica,* Rome 1923-1925 (same occasion). For chronology, see recent studies mentioned below in the notes, by Mandonnet, Synave, Pelster, Grabmann. \zarious periodicals dealing with St. Thomas: *Divus Thomas,* Freiburg; *Divus Thomas,* Placentia; *Ciencia tomista,* Madrid; *Revue thomiste,* S. Maximin ; *Rev. des Sciences phil. et théol.,* Kain ; *Vie Spirituelle,* Juvisy ; *Cahiers thomistes,* Paris, etc.

ARTICLE I. LIFE OF SAINT THOMAS'.

I. ST. THOMAS' PREPARATION FOR HIS MISSION [1225-1252].

According to William of Tocco, the saint's first biographer, Thomas died at the beginning of his fiftieth year on March 7th, 1274. He was born therefore before March 7th, 1225, either at the beginning of that year or at the end

[1] The first biographers date from lhe 14th century: William of Tocco, O. P., prior of Benevento, promotor of the cause of canonisation in 1317, wrote, between 1317 and 1321, a fully documented Life which, despite certain obscurities, is extremely valuable. Bernard Guidon is O. P., (d. 1331) a great historian, has many accounts of St. Thomas. Peter Calo, a Dominican from Northern Italy (first half of 14th cent.), has an account of St. Thomas in his *Legendarium.* Contrary to the opinion of Endres and Prlimmer, most of the historians of St. Thomas consider Tocco as the source of the other two · *ita* Denifle, Mandonnet.etc. See excellent study by E. Janssens, *Les premiers hist, de la vie de S. Ih.,* in *Rev. nio-scol.,* 1924, n. 2OI-2IÆ; 22C-2C2 452-470-
There are other sources. See *ibid.* 4

of 1224 \ His family was one of the seven or eight noble families of Italy. His father, Landulph, Count of Aquino, was related to the imperial family and through his mother he descended from Robert Guiscard. This blending of Norman and Italian blood was revealed in his temperament, both strong and robust, tender and delicate. His first education was monastic : at the age of five he was sent to Monte Cassino, where his father eventually hoped to see him as abbot. Thomas remained here probably from 1230 to 1239. While still a child he frequently asked his mentor "What is God?". This early Benedictine training gave him a permanent liturgical sense, a love of the arts, and a taste for humanities. When he was fourteen, Frederick II, excommunicated by Gregory IX, expelled the monks from the abbey (1239). Thomas put *off* the Benedictine robe and returned to his family. The latter though not giving up the idea of seeing him abbot of Cassino, sent him to the University of Naples. It was then that he first came into contact with the Preaching Friars. Attracted by the Dominican ideal he resolved to enter the Order, in spite of inevitable family opposition.

From the outset St. Thomas' vocation was beset with difficulties. His father died on December 24th, 1243, and he was at once clothed with the Dominican habit. Fearing his mother would take him away, the Master Geneial, John the Teuton, made up his mind to take him with him to Bologna and thence to Paris, then the chief centre for Dominican studies. His mother, the countess, pious but determined, pursued him as far as Rome and he was seized by his brothers Raynald and Landulph, soldiers in the imperial army, at Aquapendente in May 1244. He was taken back to Aquino where attempts were made to stifle his vocation, even by attacks on his virtue. Pie drove the prostitute from his room with a burning brand and was soon after rewarded supernaturally for his triumph over temptation, which, supposes Petitot, " was the fruit of drawn-out struggles against the demon of youth and innocence. " At the Castle of Rocca Secca, where Thomas was now taken, he was not subjected to imprisonment or solitary confinement, but to a continual watch on his movements, calculated to cut him oft' from Dominican influence and turn his mind to Monte Cassino. His sisters and friends besought him in vain ; he showed such determination that he was set free in the summer of 1245 aiKl allowed to follow his vocation a.

' Cf. MANDONNET, *Date de la naissance de* 5. 77/. *d\4q.,* in *Rev. thorn.,* 1914, p. 652-662.

' P. Mandonnet, *Thomas d\4q., novice Prêcheur,* in *Rev. thorn.,* 1924-1925, seven articles. II. Petitot, *I.a vocation de S. Thomas,* in *Vie spirit., 1922* (vol. vii), p. 605-635.

At the end of 1245 he was at *Paris*[1] attending the lectures of Albert the Great. He made great strides in his studies, thanks to his intellectual humility and his power of concentration, which earned him the name of the "dumb ox from Sicily", due in some measure also to his corpulent physique; for he was "magnus, grossus, brumis Albert the Great, who had perceived the worth of this extraordinary student and foreseen the "bellowing" of his doctrine, took him with him to Cologne in 1248, and in 1250 took him into collaboration by getting him to write out his *Commentary on the Divine Names*[2]. At the moment of his ordination to the priesthood, he was again called upon to aid his relations who had fallen on evil days: their castle had been destroyed by order of Frederick II, and Raynald executed. Under pressure from his kinsfolk, the pope offered Thomas the Abbey of Monte Cassino, and then the Archbishopric of Naples. He refused both with steadfast courage. God was reserving a higher mission for the new priest, already enamoured of a great doctrinal apostleship.

In 1252 Saint Albert sent him to Paris, there to prepare for the degree of Doctor in Theology, in spite of his youth. For Thomas this was the beginning of a period of twenty-two years of intense scientific and literary activity. It may be divided into three main parts: *a)* Paris 1252-1259; *b}* Italy* 1259-1268; r) Paris and Naples 1269-1274.

II. TEACHING AT PARIS (1252-1259).

On his first arrival in Paris Thomas began to explain the Bible as Bachelor: his opening discourse given between September 14th and October 9th 1252 is still extant[3]. Soon, however, he launched himself on the explanation of the Books of Sentences (1252). The great Commentary that resulted represents his first trial of arms and reveals the extraordinary powers already possessed by the beginner. What is most astonishing perhaps is that the opinions he then put forward needed hardly any modification in later years. The bold originality and depth of this

[1] According to Tocco, Guidonis, followed by Mandonnet. An early chronicler, however, states that he went directly to Cologne.

[2] The manuscript is extant. Also extant is Albert the Great's unpublished course on the Nichomachean Ethics, taken down and written out by Thomas. Cf. A. Pelzer, in *Rev. nto-scol.,* 1922, p. 333-361.

[3] Published in 1912, see p. 552.

new preceptor was immediately felt by his pupils. IIis biographer, the better to translate this impression, amused himself, says Petitot "by declining the adjective *novus* and its derivations in all its forms ". In his lectures he introduced *new* articles, defined them in a *new* and clearer way, solved them with *new* arguments, so that all those who heard these *new* theses, taught and explained according to a *new* method, no longer doubted that God had enlightened with a *new* light this man who, at the very outset possessed so sure a judgment that he had no hesitation in teaching and writing *new* opinions " U Thus in his first lectures his auditors were struck by his new methods, as well as his original articles, theses and opinions. His frequent use of Aristotelian philosophy in preference to Plato's, his clear distinction of philosophy from theology to which till then it had been slave rather than handmaid, and lastly his distinction of theology from mysticism by means of an honest yet moderate intellectualism, in short, all the essential elements of Thom ism were already strongly marked 2.

The young Dominican professor soon attracted all the cream of the University students and this success aggravated instead of appeasing, a conflict that was brewing between the secular masters at Paris and the religious professors3. In February 1252 the University had decided to relieve the Dominicans of one of the Chairs they occupied. In April 1253 the seculars, having closed the schools, proclaimed that they would refuse the degree of Master to any who were unwilling to swear loyalty to the corporative rule. The Friars refused, and the Dominicans were roughly handled. *Innocent IV* (1243-1254) who had been invoked by both factions, summoned to Rome four secular masters, among whom William of Saint-Amour, canon of Beauvais, a man filled with hatred for the religious. He succeeded in instilling his rancour into influential members of the Curia and imparted his fears to the pope himself, who, in May 1254, took measures that were most detrimental to the religious, especially the Minors and the Dominicans, and went as far as suppressing all their privileges. The very future of the Mendicant Orders was in the balance. *Alexander* 7Z (Dec. 1254-Mai 1261) considered the claims of the secular clergy to be excessive and gradually restored and even added to the privileges of the religious. Embittered by this check, William published his famous pamphlet, *De novissimorum temporum periculis,* m which he denounced in the ranks of the religious the false prophets who were to be legion at the coming of the Antichrist. Though the calumny was patent, the need of a sound refutation was felt. Saint Bonaventure replied to William's factual element with his

' *Vita,* c. XIV. — 2 See art. iv, p. 570.
3 See II. Petitot, 5. *Thomas a*Aq.,* (life), p. 61-So.

De paupertate Christi and in him the Franciscan Order found the most brilliant and vigorous of its spokesmen. The Chapter General of the Dominicans, held at Anagni, made a special appeal to the "twogeniuses *of* the Order , Albert and Thomas. The atter was charged with defending the religious life, for it was this in reality that was threatened.

Within a few days, Thomas, at the General's request, had composed a vigorous refutation of William's calumnies; this in its main lines, is the treatise Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem. It was read in the Chapter and approved'. " On every point that had been raised", says Petitot, "Thomas Aquinas emerged victorious : He justified with strength and moderation, both the dispensation from and the abandonment of manual work, not only individual but also collective poverty, preaching and the pastorate, confession, burials, guidance of families, study and professorships, even in the two Chairs of the University of Paris. He deduced the majority of his conclusions from a general principle, worthy of meditation and apt to correct many prejudices : that which makes the *excellence of a religious order* is not primarily, as is usually thought, the harshness of the rule, fasting and penance, but the *excellence of its ends".* All these defences of the religious life soon convinced the pope and the Curia. William of Saint-Amour was condemned by the pope, Alexander IV, and forced by the king to leave the University.

Saint Thomas returned triumphantly from Anagni to Paris at the end of the summer of 1256. He had received his licentiate at the beginning of 1256 and shortly afterwards, probably in March or April[2], was admitted to the degree of Master in Theology. There is extant, recently published, his discourse of inauguration and also probably the questions[3] that were discussed on this occasion[4]. For three years (1256-1259) Thomas, as Master, fulfilled the position of regent of studies and gave fresh life to the

[1] This can have been no more than a rough outline, for the work was not definitively completed until the following year (1257).

[3] The date determined by Fr. Mandonnet. No doubt a number of administrative formalities were still required and this necessitated the pope's intervention for almost another year. Letter from Alexander IV, Oct. 23rd 1256. Denifle-Chatelain, *Chartul. univ. par.,* 1, p. 339. Cf. *ibid.,p.* 369. The traditional date lor the final raising of Thomas and Bonaventure to the degree of Master in the University is October 23rd 1257.

[2] " The solemnities for the degree of Master in Theology', termed the *principium,* i. e., graduation, were divided into two parts : the *vespere* and the *aulica.* The candidate, among other things, was required to present four questions or theses for discussion ". Fr. Mandonnet, in *Rev. sc. ph. th.,* 1927. P- 30-

[4] These are probably the two last articles (17-18) of quodlibet vii, treating of the work of religious, and were aimed at the adversaries of the Mendicants. *Ibid.,* p. 27-30; also perhaps the three previous questions (14-16 of the same quodlibei) concerning the meaning of the Scriptures, though these may date from when Thomas explained the Bible as Bachelor. *Ibid.,* p. 30-31. They were included in this series of quodlibets at a later date. See below, p. 548.

teaching, the better to improve the disordered state of affairs in the University. "The disputations in the faculty of theology had almost fallen into disuse. Thomas took upon himself to supply them and even more. He inaugurated a double weekly disputation, with corresponding sessions for their solution. Four mornings of the week were thus occupied. In the space of three school years there resulted from this the 253 disputations that form the *Quæstiones de Veritate*"[1]. Later, Thomas was to reduce the number of disputations to one every fortnight[2]; but at this time he increased their number to fall in with the students' taste for this kind of exercise and also to militate against those masters who were hostile to the monks.

"Animated with the same purpose and ideas, Thomas was obviously led to institute the quodlibetic disputation. The interest aroused by the ordinary disputation, in which the subject was determined by the master would be increased tenfold were the subject left to the initiative of the auditors, while matters for discussion would become legion. The quodlibetic disputation, of which Thomas had probably dreamt before obtaining his degree of Master was therefore inaugurated. It need scarcely be pointed out that the difficulties inherent to the ordinary disputation were enormously increased in this new form, since it was possible, *ex abrupto,* to confront the master with any kind of problem in philosophy or theology. The quodlibetic disputation was pre-eminently a test of the extent of the master's learning and the quickness of his wits"[3]. St. Thomas was probably its author[4],* and this institution constituted another answer to the prejudices held by the seculars against the religious.

These discussions formed only a small part of St. Thomas' work at this period. After taking his degree he made *Holy Writ* the basis of his theological teaching. We still possess his lectures, either written by him *(expositio),* or taken down by a chosen auditor *(lectura)*[5]. He explained the Old and the New Testament alternately. The books he commented during his first period of three years were the prophecy of Isaias and the Gospel of St. Matthew (the last taken down by an auditor)[6]. He also completed his first treatise on the religious life (1257) and in the following year (1258), undertook at the request of Raymond de Pennafort, the valiant apostle of the Spanish and African Saracens, his magnificent apologetic work, the *Summa contra Gentiles,* which was not completed until about 1261 in Italy.

1 *Ibid.,* p. 13.

* He suppressed them completely at Naples, as a temporary measure.

3 *Ibid.,* p. 13-14.

4 See Fr. MANDONNET, S. *Thomas créateur du quodlibet,* in the art. quoted from *Rev. sc. ph. théol.,* 1926, p. 477-506, 1927, p. 5-38. See below, p. 548.

5 See p. 472.

6 By Peter of Andria and another unknown helper. Cf. Mandonnet, *ibid.,* p. 238-239.

III. THE THEOLOGIAN AND THE ROMAN CURIA [1259-1268].

At the close of his three years as regent of studies at Paris (1256-1259) Saint Thomas was summoned to Rome to the Papal court by Alexander IV[1] who held him in great esteem ». Here he was to remain, save for two years' teaching in Rome (1265-67), following the popes who succeeded each other rapidly, until the autumn of 1268 (Alexander IV : 1254-1261; Urban IV : 1261-1264; Clement IV : 1264-1268) in the various towns in which the Curia was successively setup: Anagni (1259-1261), Orvieto (1261-1265), Viterbo (1267-1268). This stay in Italy was important, "for two chief reasons; first of all, because St. Thomas, in constant contact with the cardinals and the pope, became the theologian of the Curia and the Holy See; secondly, since he obtained the leisure to make a new and deeper study of Aristotle and the Fathers of the Church"[2].

Alexander IV[1] had called Thomas to his side precisely for this latter reason. A nephew of Gregory IX, the great promotor of ecclesiastical studies in the Middle Ages, Alexander IV was resolved to fulfil one of his uncles most cherished schemes : the expurgation of Aristotle's works. Gregory had been well aware that excommunications alone were not enough to prevent works such as Aristotle's from finding then-way into intellectual and especially University circles. While confirming the decree made by the Archbishop of Sens (1210) and approved by the legate, Robert of Courçon (1215) which forbade under pain of excommunication the interpretation of Aristotle's works at Paris, he had charged the University with the care of revising these works and named a commission of three members for this purpose[3]. This commission found itself unable to carry out such an onerous task, with the result that the unexpurgated works of the Stagirite gradually spread among scholars in the form of Arabian translations and commentaries, especially

[1] In 1246 Innocent IV had founded a *Stadium genérale* at the Papal court. This was no other than a Dominicans monastic school frequented both by religious and secular clergy. Dating from this return to his province Thomas was aided by a secretary *(socius) Raynald*(Reginald) *of Piperno,* who " reported several of the great doctors's commentaries, notably on Aristotle's *De anima,* the *Psalms, St. John's Gospel,* and *St. Paul's Epistles.* St. Thomas dedicated several writings to him (particularly the *Compendium theol.').* After his death Raynald succeeded to his chair at Naples and was given the task of collecting the master's writings. St. Thomas nourished a special affection for his young disciple and it is thanks to Raynald that many details of his life have been preserved. Cf. MANDONNET, in *Rev. th.,* 1927, p. 123-124. Cf. *Ibid.,* 1928, p. 145.

[2] H. Petitot, *Vie,* p. 82. — [3] See above, p. 479.

that of Averroes, which made them all the more dangerous. Averroism and Aristotelism began to be synonymous terms. It is to the credit of Albert the Great that he thought it possible to adapt Aristotle's)hilosophy to Christianity and worked to this end. He was able, towever, to prepare the ground only by means *of* general studies. His treatise *De unitate intellectus contra Averroen* written at the instance of Alexander IV, only partially stemmed the tide, swollen by the official recognition of Aristotle in the syllabus of the faculty of arts at Paris (March 19th, 1255). Prompt action was imperative.

Saint Thomas was called upon to resume and *complete his masters work.* The original text of Aristotle had first to be found. William of Moerbeke, a Dominican and fine Greek scholar made a faithful literal translation, without straining after style. St. Thomas worked on this text: he was to comment the Philosopher's work, correct it (interpret it *reverenter,* it was said) in a manner calculated to render it harmless to the faith, and make it instead an instrument for the better understanding of dogma. He began with the Physics (1265) and the Metaphysics (1265) ; then came the treatises dealing with Psychology and Ethics (1266-1267), speedily followed (1268) by studies on the books of Politics and Analytics. Thomas had thus laboured on the more important of the philosopher's books when he was recalled to Paris in 1269; here he commented four other works, without however exhausting the Stagirite's vast writings. It may at least be said that the essentials of his ideas had been seized upon, moulded and even made perfect '.

These special studies and writings that were imposed on Saint Thomas by various circumstances, and sometimes at the instance of highly placed personages[1] were added to his everyday teaching. His subject at this period, in the Old Testament, was the Canticle of Canticles, the Lamentations and Jeremías, and in the New, St. Paul, all of whose Epistles he explained for the first time. We still possess in various forms a large number of these lectures, while the majority of the disputations belonging to this period are found in the *De Potentia* (1259-1263) and the *DeMaio* (1263-1268). Entrusted with the task of forming a *Studium generale* for his province at Rome in 1265-67, St. Thomas was led anew to comment *the Sentences,* and his new lectures were passed from hand to hand. He felt himself constrained however by the limits of Lombard's

[1] See art. II, p. 541.

[5] He undertook his " Running Explanation " of the Gospels *(Catena Aurea)* at the request of Urban IV, as well as the treatise *Against the errors of the Grids,* and composed the Office of the Blessed Sacrament (1264) for the feast of Corpus Christi instituted at that time. On the latter occasion he made a solemn discourse still extant. See p. 551 Among his opuscula (p. 550-552) may be found a number of works composed on special occasions.

books. He abandoned this work, recalled the copies already in circulation and undertook a new doctrinal synthesis based on a new plan [1]. This was the work that was to make his name immortal, the *Summa theologica,* commenced about 1267. He was admirably fitted for writing this great work, intended like Lombard's to be a students' manual. All the leisure that was left to him by his manifold occupations during the last six years of his life (1267-1273) was devoted to its composition.

IV. LAST YEARS OF TEACHING AT PARIS (1269-1272) AND NAPLES (1272-1274). DESCRIPTION OF ST. THOMAS.

In November 1268, St. Thomas was suddenly recalled to *Paris* where he arrived in January 1269. His return was providential[2]. He alone appeared capable of assuring the success of the intellectual movement lie had set in motion and which was then facing a determined opposition in the University. Thomas was called upon to combat rigid *Averroists* who rejected his revised Aristotelian teaching and *Augustinians* who even in the midst of his own Order, together with Franciscans and seculars, defended the ancient methods and teaching [3]. His most bitter antagonists, however, were *the enemies of the Mendicant Orders* who were rallying anew. Against these Thomas wrote first his "De perfectione vitæ spiritualis" (1269) and shortly afterwards with redoubled force, his " Contra pestiferam doctrinam retrahentium homines a religionis ingressu" (1270). The condemnation of Averroism in December 1270 marked the defeat of St. Thomas' chief opponents. At the end of the academic year of 1272, his superiors recalled him to Italy and he was put to teach in the University of Naples, at the desire of the king himself who wished to make certain of the successful outcome of the reorganisation he was carrying out [4].

These last years, during which the saint revealed the fullness of his mental vigour and attained to the maturity

[1] The purpose of this new step is indicated in the Prologue of the Summa. See below, art. in, p. 555.

[2] Thomas was called to Paris to take the place of a master who had fallen ill, but he was retained there for three years by his superiors who realised the importance of the situation See the list of quodlibetic disputations, p. 549 note I.

[3] See art. IV, p. 578. — « Fr. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant,* p. cexv.

of genius were mainly spent in the writing of the *Summa theologica.* Only the First Part had been completed when he went to Paris in 1268. There he wrote the whole of the Second Part with its 303 questions. The 90 questions that he composed in the Third Part were written in 1272-1273[1]. All his other works of the same period, no matter how brilliant, lose their lustre when compared with the *Summa.* They are not devoid of interest however. The Parisian controversies, of course, were the immediate occasion for a number of shorter opuscula, the *De unitate intellectus conila Avèrroistas* * and the *De ceternitate mundi contra murmurantes* (the Augustinians); but simultaneously with all these tasks, Saint Thomas pursued his *commentaries,* both on Aristotle and the Holy Scriptures (Job and the Psalms, St. John's Gospel and St. Paul's Epistles) and never failed to take part in academic disputations as witness the quod-libets that date from this period. Nor did this prodigious output hinder him from pastoral *preaching* in keeping with the Dominican tradition. There is still extant, in addition to the sermon plans at the beginning of his priestly life (1254 et sq.), those of his last instructions (Lent 1273) on the *Pater,* the *Ave,* the *Credo* and the ten commandments; precious texts, which though they cannot give us an adequate idea of his eloquence, are of great interest.

It is nowadays customary to attempt some description of the physical and moral traits of St. Thomas[3]. *His commanding appearance,* as Petitot puts it, must have made him an imposing figure. His great height rendered his corpulence less apparent. He held himself upright with a suggestion of stiffness. His uplifted head revealed a wide forehead while his baldness made his head seem even bigger than it was. *Spiritually,* St. Thomas was an ascetic and even more so a mystic. Not only did he read with interest but also practised Cassian's Conferences. His *asceticism**, however, was not distinguished by any extraordinary bodily macerations as was the case with even contemporary Dominican saints. He was content to observe the austerities of his rule, harsh enough in all conscience, and endeavoured particularly to practise a true, simple, and modest humility, exempt from violence and excess; a humility that redounds all the more to his

[1] These dates «arc based on sound evidence, though they are only approximative in some details. Cf. Grabmann, *La Somme th.,* p. 30-34.

[2] According to Mandonnet this treatise is a refutation of Siger's *De anima.* Others think, on the contrary, that the *De anima* was written against him.

thiol., p. 129-134.

[4] Petitot, *ibid.,* p. 107-126.

credit since even while he lived he was the object of great esteem. He was very reserved in the presence of women and even avoided visits from persons of note; only once did he accept an invitation from Saint Louis. He controlled his intellectual curiosity and made the necessary sacrifices to specialisation. He thus rendered himself more apt for study and maintained a closer union with God. That is why he was able so easily to pass from study to prayer. His prayer was usually accompanied by the greatest and even extraordinary *mystical gifts',* ecstasies, visions, ravishments. At his mass he literally burst into tears *(totus perfundebatur lacrymis).* All these graces brought great enlightenment with them, so that when difficulties gave him pause he plunged himself into deep meditation, which justifies the remark of Fr. Petitot: "The Summa theologica was the fruit of prayer and contemplation as well of study and speculation"[2]. That power of concentration he evinced in his studies and in all his affairs, and which seemed to give almost an impression of suffering, can only be explained by these supernatural gifts.

St. Thomas' theological labours were brusquely cut short in their flower by an early death. Pope Gregory X, having demanded his presence at the Council of Lyons in 1274, Thomas took the road with Raynald at the beginning of January, taking with him, in all probability, the manuscripts necessary for the continuation of his work, especially the *Summa.* The hardships of the journey caused him great fatigue[3], rapidly degenerating into a serious illness. Taking refuge at the Cistercian monastery of Fossa Nuova at the beginning of February, he died a month later on March 7th, 12744. He was canonised by John XXII on July 18th 1323, proclaimed *Doctor of the Church* by Pius V on April nth 1567, and held up as guide and patron of philosophical and theological studies by all the popes since Leo XIII [5].

[*] *Ibid.,* p. 126-134.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 132.

[3] Fr. Petitot connects this weariness of St. Thomas with an extraordinary favour granted to him on December 6th 1273 : during Holy Mass, he was, according to Tocco "strangely and wonderfully' moved" *(mira mutaliont commotus)* which as been understood as meaning an ecstatic revelation, and Fr. Petitot concludes : he died because he saw God. II. PETITOT, *La mort dt S. Th. d'Aq.,* in *Vie spirit.,* 1924 (vol. x), p. 312-336.

[4] For the somewhat tempestuous history of St. Thomas' relics, see *La Rcvitt august.,* 190S (vol. Xii), p. 195-206.

[-] Cf. *Codex juris can.,* can. 589, par. I, and 1366, par. 2.

ARTICLE II.

WORKS OF SAINT THOMAS[1]*

(EXCEPTING THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA).

I. PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS.

All St. Thomas' theological works are based on philosophy and all throw light on his ideas on this subject. His philosophy however is more completely explained in his purely philosophical works, either in the form of commentaries on Aristotle or in more personal and shorter treatises on special questions.

A). Commentaries on Aristotle.

Not only their extent but also the way in which he conceived and carried out the interpretation make these commentaries of great importance. " He substituted for the lenghty and popular paraphrases of Aristotle, a more critical apparatus, a literal commentary that circumscribes the text. *Quodam singulari et novo modo tradendi utebatur,* says Ptolemy of Lucca. For the better perfection of such a commentary he was careful to obtain trustworthy versions and begged William of Moerbeke to revise the existing translations or produce new translations. The latter aided him in the writing of his commentaries, which goes to explain why St. Thomas possessed so deep an understanding of Aristotle, and so superior to his master's. On many exegetical questions he recognised the Stagirite's authentic teaching and refused to saddle him with many errors that were reproached him by others. It should be remarked that Thomas' commentaries contain many of his own ideas that are easily recognisable. The introductions to his works and books are entirely his own "[3].

Every part of Aristotle's work was subjected to commentaries, though certain books were omitted. The following were explained[3] at least in part :[4]

a) Logic or Organon : i. *On Interpretation* or *Peri hermenias* 1269-1271); 2. *Second Analytics {circa* 1268 or after). The Categories, First Analytics, the Topics and Refutations were omitted.

* For their authenticity see especially Fr. MANDONNET, *Les écrits authentiques de S. Th. d'Aq.,* Freiburg, 1910. Since then, many additional studies.

[2] M. DBWulf, *Hist, de la f>hil. médiévale,* II, p. 5. See M. Grabmann, *Les Commentaires de S. Th. d'Aq. sur les ouvrages d'Aristote.* Extract from the *Amtales de ΓInstitut sufi. de Phil.,* Louvain 1914, p. 231-281.

[3] Vives ed., vol. 22-26; Parma, vol. 18-21; Leonine, vol. ı-tu (half only).

[4] Many of these commentaries are unfinished. Cf. MANDONNET, *Bibl. thomiste,* p. xix-xxi.

¿) PHYSICS (general and philosophical principles of the sciences): 3. *the VIII books* entirely (about 1265).

c) Natural Sciences: 4. *De calo et mundo,* the first 3 books (1272-1273); 5. *De generatione et corruf)tione*\ the 2 books (1272-1273; 6. *Meteorologica,* the first two books (1269-1271. A number of other treatises on the natural sciences remained without explanation.

</) Psychology: 7. *De anima,* the 3 books *{circa* 1266); 8. opusculum *De sensu et sensato* (1266); 9. op. *De memoria* (1266). Seven other opuscula were left aside.

z?) Metaphysics: io. the first 12 books (1265).

/) Ethical philosophy: ii. The *Nichomachean Ethics,* the 10 books (1266). The Magna moralia and the Eudemian Ethics were omitted.

g) Politics: 12. Commentary of books, 1, 11 and in, ch. 1-6(1268). The last books were left without explanation 9 as also the De Poetica and the De Rhetorica.

In addition St. Thomas commented the *De causis*[3] showing that it was of Neoplatonic origin (1269), and also Boethius' *De hebdomadibus* (about 1257) Í

All these commentaries were the most profound ever written on the Greek philosopher. St. Thomas' corrections far from diminishing the value of his works, increased it, since they repaired the defects caused by Aristotle's naturalism.

B). Original Philosophical works.

The *8 philosophical opuscula* that contain the result of St. Thomas' personal speculation are extant; several of them were provoked by the controversies.

1. op. 27: *De principiis natura* (1255).
2. op. 26: *De ente et essentia*[3] (1256).
3. op. 15: *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas* (1270).
4. op. 23: *De aternitate mundi contra murmurantes* (1270).
5. op. 14: *De substantiis separatis* or *De Natura Angelorum* 1273) ,n [9] chapters: very important for a knowledge of the saint's teaching on the angels
6. op. 29: *De mixtione elementorum* (1273).

[*] Probably only the first 17 lessons from book I are authentic. See however Mandonnet, *ibid.,* p. xx.

[•] The remainder of the published commentary is by Peter of Auvergne. M. Grabmann, in *Phil. lahrbuch,* 1915, p. 373-378·

[3] Vives ed., vol. 26; Parma, vol. 21. The *De causis* is a Neoplatonic work consisting of extracts from Proclus (Στοιχείωσι Οεολογιζή) and passing in the Middle Ages as Aristotle's work. Cf. O. Bardenhewer, *Die pseudo-aristotelische Schrift... Liber de causis,* Freiburg, 1882.

[4] Op. 62. See the following note.

[5] In this youthful work are already found the fundamental theses of Tlwmist philosophy on the principle of individuation and the distinction of essence and existence in created substances. Cf. D. Roland-Gosselin, O. P., critical edition and commentary, Kain, 1926. Brunetteau's ed., 1914.

7. op. 30 : *De occultis operationibus natura* (1269-1273).
8. op. 31 : *De motu cordis* (1273).

Inali these works the author uses the expository method. He is as clear and precise as he is profound '.

II. COMMENTARY OF THE IV BOOKS OF SENTENCES'.

This work " was greatly appreciated and widely read both in his own time and later, as is proved by the considerable number of manuscripts. The *Summa theologica* did not really make superfluous this great work of his youth. Points are not lacking on which the *Commentary on the Sentences* is more explicit than the Summa. Further, the study of the Commentary on the Sentences makes the progress achieved by Thomas before writing his Summa particularly apparent and sensible " 3.

Right from the *Prologue,* probably written last, we notice the need of synthesis felt by this powerful mind. Desirous of justifying the master's division of the work into four books, Thomas looks back to Divine Wisdom, attributed especially to the Son of God. The role of this wisdom is indeed fourfold : 1. *To make God known* and particularly the *Divine Persons:* " Ipse Deus per suam sapientiam seipsum plene et perfecte cognoscit. Unde si quid de ipso cognoscimus, oportet quod ex eo derivetur, quia omne imperfectum a perfecto trahit originem... Haec autem manifestatio per Filium facta invenitur...". 2. *To produce created beings :* " Pertinet ad Dei sapientiam creaturarum productio; ... processus temporalis creaturarum ab æterno processu personarum (c erivatur); ...Verbum genuit in quo erat ut fierent; creatura procedit a Deo extra unitatem essentiæ ". He treats successively of created things in general, of angels, men, grace and sin. 3. *To restore its work:* "Per idem enim debet reparari per quod facta sunt. Unde quæ per Sapientiam condita sunt, decet ut per Sapientiam reparentur ". Consequently he writes here of the Redemption and the graces that are its consequence. 4. *To perfect its work:* " Ad Dei Sapientiam pertinet perfectio qua res conservantur in suo fine ...hoc etiam ad Filium specialiter pertinet; ...ut nos in finem æternæ gloriæ induceret sacramentorum medicamenta praeparavit, quibus a nobis peccati vulnus abstergitur". The subject of the fourth book in thus twofold : the sacraments and the glory of the Resurrection. "Et sic patet ex praedictis verbis intentio libri Sententiarum ", concludes the Commentator.

The division of the *Sumina theologica* marks an enormous advance in depth, precision, and clarity compared with the

' For the fundamental principles of Thomist philosophy, sec p. 576.
3 Vives ed., vol. 7-11; Parma, vol. 6-7.
3.M. Grabmann, *La Somme th.,* p. 42.

preceding work. This advance, is no less apparent in the teaching itself. On several points, the young professor in spite of his originality * remained faithful to *traditional Augustinism.* His ideas continued to develop until they were fixed for all time in the *Summa.* " It would therefore bea mistake", says Petitot, "to attribute to Saint Thomas Aquinas opinions on the causality of the sacraments, analogy, and the active intellect[2], put forward in the Commentary on the Sentences, but corrected and amended in later works and given their final expression in the *Summa* ". It should first be remarked that in some cases, possibly as regards the causality of the sacrament, St. Thomas changed his viewpoint rather than his ideas[3]. On other points, however, there is complete opposition, i. e., the guilt of *drunkenness*[4]. In other matters he takes up a firmer and more precise attitude between diverse opinions; for the unity of *substantial being* in Christ, for instance: in the Commentary, St. Thomas admits this unity as an opinion that does not exclude two other current theories; in the *Summa* he regards the latter as heresies[5]. Elsewhere, a teaching set out at first with diffidence gradually hardens until the thought is finally moulded in a definitive expression : the specific act of *beatitude* is thus progressively freed from the affective elements that still cling to it in the Commentary, in order to become, in the *Summa,* essentially and exclusively an act of the intelligence, a knowledge[6]. These instances reveal how useful is the Commentary for a serious study of Thomist thought : it represents the first link in the chain ; the *Summa theologica* and the Compendium are the last, while the Summa contra Gentes the questions and the scriptural works represent in varying degrees the intervening links[7].

* See above, p. 553. —[3] See however below, p. 578, n. I. —[1] See below, p. 628 sq.

[4] According to the commentary on the Sent., the *act* of drunkenness is of itself venial and becomes mortal through repetition which shows that the drinker is making the vice his last end *(In II Sent.,* D. xxiv, q. 3, a. 6). In the *Summa* the act is said to be mortal *in se* but may be venial *per accidens.* I II e, q. SS, a. 5, ad i; ii-næ, q. 150, a. 2. Cf. Fr. Mandonnet, in *Rev. sc. phil. th..* 1928, p. 229-235 *(Chrono/. des écrits script.).*

[5] *In III Sent.,* I), vi, q. 2, a. 2. *Sum. th.,* in, q, 2, a. 6. Cf. MANDONNET, *Ecrits auth.,* p. 134-135.

[6] *In II Sent.,* 'O. Xï.ιχ, q. i, a. I. *Sum. th.,* t-næ a 2 a a Cf Mandonnet, u> *R*>* ,<·. *ph lh..* 1926, p 497.506 *(S. Th. '^¡« Uur'duquMiuit*

[7] See bdow"9*63'1 -C h,S ¡θΓ an h'StOncal study of the Summa is obvious.

III. THE SUMMA CONTRA GENTES [1] (1258-1261).

This great apologetical work has rightly been termed the philosophical Summa, though it is far from being a treatise of philosophy in the modern meaning of the word. Theology occupies a large place therein, for it is here that St. Thomas lays its philosophical foundations. He "explores the inmost recesses of the harmonious relations of the natural and supernatural, of reason and faith. The *Summa contra Gentes* possesses especial charm and produces the impression of a powerfully coherent and perfect train of thought because its ideas and arguments are drawn and deducted from the great truths, principles and fundamental notions of the metaphysical order, to which constant appeal is made and which bear up the whole as the framework holds together a building "[2].

The purpose and method of the work are indicated in the first 9 chapters of book 1. The unbeliever is to be gradually led to admitting the Christian dogmas. The latter, however are not immediately stated. The author first sets out at length those truths than can be discovered by reason alone, although they are confirmed and their understanding facilitated by revelation. He then goes on to higher truths, beginning (end of bk. Ill) with those, which being concerned with morality, are more easily accessible : the great mysteries in the true meaning of the word are kept for the end of the work. In explaining natural truths St. Thomas has recourse to strict demonstration ; for the others he does no more than show that they are not absurd. Any attempt at positive demonstration,useful perhaps "ad fidelium exercitium et solatium ", would weaken the case, for opponents could not fail to see their insufficiency.

The matter of the four books is thus distributed : *book* ***I*** (102 chaps.) first treats of the existence of *God* (10-14), His infinite perfections (15-43), His knowledge (44-71), His will (79-96) and lastly His life and blessedness (97-102). *Book* ***II*** is devoted to the *works of God* (101 chaps.). Having indicated the method to be followed (1-5), author writes of the power of God and his relations with created things (6-14), creation in general (15-30); he shows that creation in time is not repugnant (31-38), that God Himself is the cause of the distinction of beings (39-45); he studies at length intellectual substances in themselves (46-55); in their union with the body (56-72), in their understanding (73-78), their origin (79-90), and ends with separate substances (91-101). In *book* ***III*** (163 chaps.), St. Thomas shews (Was the *last end.* Having given general notions on good and evil (1-24), he proves that man's happiness lies solely in the contemplation

[1] Vives ed., vol. 12; Parma, vol. 5; Leonine, vol. 13 (Rome, 1918), vol. 14 (1926). On this last ed., see A. Pelzer, in *Rev. néo-scol.,* 1920, p. 217-245. See also Fr. Destrel., in *Bulletin thorn.*, May, 1929, p. 501-515.

[2] M. Grabmann, *Somme th.,* p. 43.

of God (25-37) and that this is possible only by means of the beatific vision in the next life (38-63). God governs all things by His Providence (64-97), miracles are not incompatible with the latter (98-110); He leads created beings to their last end by His law (i 11-146): St. Thomas especially stresses the divine law as regards marriage and the vows of religion; lastly, divine grace aids man to attain his end (147-163). *Book IV* (97 chaps.), treats apologetically and philosophically of the *Christian mysteries:* Trinity (2-26), Incarnation (27-55), Sacraments (56-78), and lastly eternal life (79-97).

The Summa contra Gentes is the most profound and beyond a doubt the most powerful apologetical work ever written. It is composed moreover with a skill that St. Thomas probably never bettered.

IV. DISPUTED QUESTIONS[1] AND QUODLIBETIC QUESTIONS.

A). The De Veritate [1256-1259][2].

This work is not, like the Summa, a methodical treatise, but consists of a great number of questions discussed at Paris. On these subjects St. Thomas wrote pages that have no equal in all his works for their depth of insight, fullness of development and at times the warmth of their eloquence. Speaking not only to students but also to masters, and unfettered by the exigences of a set course, the Angel of the Schools was able to soar to the highest summits. The 29 questions are divided into articles[3] each article beginning with the statement of 10, 15, 20 or even 25 objections. The doctor opposes to them a brief *Sed contra,* consisting of a general solution based on a text of the Scriptures or the Fathers. He then goes on immediately with the argument from reason in which the principles of solution are set out with astounding force, making the answer to each of the proposed difficulties extremely simple.

[1] On the chronology of the disputed questions in general, see Fr. Mandonnet, in *Bev. thorn.,* 1918, p. 266-287, 341-371. P. SVNAVE, *ibid.,* 1926, p. 154'159- New edit, of all the disputed questions prepared by Fr. Mandonset, Ò'. *Th. Aq. qiuestiones disputatu·...,* Paris, 1925 (Introduction, p. 1-24 of vol. 1). General notion of the *disputed question,* see above, p. 471.

[2] Vives ed., vol. 14; Parma, vol. 9.

[3] These correspond to the same number of disputations. 253 were held in the course of 3 years, about 84 each year or two weekly. Judging by the number of articles or disputations, the 29 questions of the *De Ventate* mav be thus spread out : a) 1256-1257: quest. 1-8 (84 arts); ¿) 1257-1258: q. 0-20 (84 arts); *c)* 125S-1259 : q. 21-29 (85 arts).

The most profound subjects concerning God and man are thus studied with reference to truth. The first 20 questions treat of them directly, while the last nine deal with the moral conduct of intelligent beings, conduct that is ruled by truth. Having studied truth in general (q. 1), St. Thomas considers it *in God (2-7* : knowledge of God. 2 ; ideas of God, 3; the Word, 4; Providence, 5; predestination, 6; the book of life, 7), *in angels* (8-9) and lastly (Second Part) *in man* (10-20) : at this stage St. Thomas renders more explicit from an Aristotelian viewpoint—or rather Thomist, since there is much that is new in his explanations—expressions that are found in the Fathers and especially St. Augustine. He therefore speaks successively "de mente" (10), "de magistro", (11), of prophecy (12), ravishment (13), faith (14), superior and inferior reason (15; cf. St. Bonaventure), synderesis (16), conscience (17). Questions 18, 19, 20 treat of the knowledge of the first man, of the soul separated from the body and of the soul of Christ. The LAST PART first defines the *idea of good* (21): good is "primo et principaliter esse perfectivum alterius, per modum finis"; good implies being and adds thereto a relation to the end pursued by the will, just as truth is being " in quantum conformatum est, vel conformabile intellectui". St. Thomas then goes on to study the human (22) and the divine (23) wills, and then completes the natural psychology of man (free will, 24; sensuality 25; passions *of* the soul 26), and his supernatural psychology (grace 27; justification of the wicked 28); finally he applies all these ideas to Christ (concerning the grace of Christ, 29).

This treatise, written in similar circumstances to the "De Veritate", contains ten questions *on God and the Trinity**. Having shewn the meaning of power and all-powerfulness in God (q. 1), St. Thomas seeks what the "*potentia generativa*" may be in Him, and compares it to "*Potentia creativa*". These are undoubtedly identical "si consideretur id quod est potentia", though very different, "secundum diversos actus ad quos potentiæ dicuntur" : the act of creation like the act of understanding is an essential act : the act of generation is a *notional* act, either relative or personal (2). Therefore, St. Thomas, dealing in the four following questions with the problems attendant on creation (3-4), the preservation of beings (5) and miracles (6), devotes the last four to problems concerning the Blessed Trinity; divine simplicity (7), relations in God (8), divine persons (9) and the processions of these persons (10).

This treatise contains the solutions to the fundamental problems of morality. It comprises 16 questions[4], that may be classed under two

[2] Vivesedit., vol. 13; Parma, vol. 8.

[3] 83 «articles corresponding to the scholastic disputations (one every fortnight) of the first four years of his teaching in Italy, according to Mandonnet. (Fr. Synave, however, puts them between 1265 and 1268 : *op. cit.).*

[3] Vivesed., vol. 13; Parma, vol. 8.

[4] tot articles corresponding to scholastic disputations over five years, from 1263 to 1268. Cf. Mandonnet *(op. cit.),* and *Introd,* to the 1925 edit, (p. 15). [Fr. Synave puts them between 1269 and 1271].

heads. The *first seven* treat of *sin in the true meaning of the word,* i. e., of evil in general (i), of sin and its cause (2-3), of original sin (4-5) and *of* venial sin (7). The single article that makes question 6, deals with liberty. The *secondfart* (q. 8-15), treats of the capital sins, first in general (8), and then successively, vainglory (9), envy (10) sloth (acedia) (11), anger (12), greed (13), gluttony (14), sensuality (15). Question 16 (de daemonibus) forms an excellent conclusion to the whole work.

In this work the Angelic Doctor completed the labours of Cassian and St. Gregory[2] by providing the definitive classification of the capital sins[a].

D). Other " Quæstiones Disputatæ " [3].

Since the incomplete series *De unione Verbi incarnati* should probably be dated from the end of St. Thomas' residence at the papal court (Autumn 1268)[4], the others must date from his second period of teaching at Pans (1269-1272), in the following order :

a) the 11 articles of the *De spiritualibus creaturis* correspond to the disputations held from January to June, 1269;

¿) the 21 articles *De anima* date from the year 1269-1270;

c} lastly, the 36 articles *De virtutibus* represent the disputations for the greater part of the years 1270-1272 (Virtues in general, cardinal virtues, charity, fraternal correction, hope).

The choice of questions on spiritual beings and on the soul is explained by the need of controverting the Averroist theories and as a defence against the attacks fiom the masters in the faculty of theology, who were attached to the old Augustinism.

There are in addition *three isolated questions,* appended to the quodlibets, concerning the meaning of the Scriptures *(quodl.* VII, a. 14-16), on manual labour *(ibid.,* a. 17-18), on children entering religious orders *(quodl.,* IV, a. 23-24)[5].

E). Quodlibetic questions[6].

Among the twelve quodlibetic questions that are extant, two groups should be distinguished : questions i-vi together with question Nil, which represent the matter of the extraordinary disputations

1 See vol. I, p. 597 and above, p. 246.

2 *Sum. th.,* Ia næ, q. 84. — 3 Vives ed., vol. 14; I'arma, vol. 8.

4 The year that had begun was interrupted by his sudden departure for Paris, where another subject demanded treatment. The authenticity of the *De unione* has been doubted since the author distinguishes in Christ an " esse principale", and an ""esse secundarium", a distinction that Thomas does not use elsewhere. Nevertheless quodlibet ix, a. 3, contains something similar. Cf. Mandonnet, *Ecrits auth.,* p. 132-137. This author, inclined to be doubtful in 1910, stated in 1925 that his suspicion was not justified *(Introd,* to the edit, of the Quæst. disp., p. 16). On the teaching, see below, p. 623.

5 This last dates from March 1271 and the other two from 1256. There is also extant a record of a disputed question *on beatitude* (1266): ed. in *Rev. thorn.,* 1918, p. 366-371.

6 Vives ed., vol. 15; Parma, vol. 9. Cf. MANDONNET, 5. *Th., créateur dn quodlibet,* m *Rev. sc. f>h. thiol.,* 1926, p. 477-506, 1927, p. 5-38.

maintained by St. Thomas during his second residence in Paris (1269-1272), and questions vil-χι dating from his first teaching at Paris (1256-1259). They were probably spread out over the course of four scholastic years, at the rate *of two a year,* one before Christmas, the other before Easter'. Those of the first group (except the 12th)a were the first tobe published, probably during the author's lifetime, at Paris. The others, remaining among St 'Thomas' papers, were added to them later. Since these latter texts then came from Italy it was thought that they had been taught in that country, and for a long period these quodlibets were considered as dating from his stay at the papal court. It now appears established that they are anterior3 and this fact gives them great importance from an historical viewpoint : they are the first known veritable quodlibets 4. Those *of* Gerard of Abbeville, which alone might have been anterior must now' be regarded as imitations : Thomas Aquinas it would seem, was the author *of* the quodlibet5. It is obviously impossible to give even a summary analysis of this collection here.

V. OPUSCULA6. SERMONS.

The very numerous opuscula edited under the name of St. Thomas are arranged in a very arbitrary manner inseverai series7. A fair number of these are apocryphal, and it is no easy task to weed them out from those that are authentic. The most sure criterion appears to be the official catalogue that was produced at the process of canonisation (1319) and which had been drawn up immediately

1 Mandonnet classes them as follows: Second residence in Paris (1269-1272, three years and a half: St. Thomas came only' in January) *quodlibet I*, 1269, Easter; 11, 1269, Christmas; in, 1270 (Easter); x ii, 1270, Christmas; iv, 1271, Easter; v, 1271, Christmas; vi, 1272, Easter. First residence (1256-1259): *quodl.,* vu, 1256, Christmas; (Easter 1257 is missing); vm, 1257, Christmas; IX, 1258, Easter; X, 1258, Christmas; XI, 1259, Easter. *Op. cit.,* p. 38.

3 I he xnth quodlibet, a simple '*lectio reportata'* seems to have remained among St. Thomas' papers and was later added to the second group.

3 See Mandonnet's proof, *op. cit.*

4 Those mentioned by Grabmann in the 12th cent., do not appear to be true quodlibets. See also Fr. Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique de 1260* ‹7 /J20, Kain, 1925.

5 The solemn and interminable *Sorbouica* may be considered as a remote development of the quodlibet, and even the famous defence *De omni re scibili* by Pico della Mirandola.

6 Vives ed., vol. 27-32; Parma, vol. 15-17. New ed.. Paris (Lethielleux), 1927 (prepared by Mandonnet : revised order of matters and Introduction, 1.111 pages). Cf. by the same, *Les Opuscules de .S'. Th. d'Aq.,* in *Rev. thorn.,* 1927, p. 121-157. See also M. GRABMANN, *Die echten Schriften des hi. Thomas v. Aq.*

3Three main series : *a) Theological Opuscula,* numbering seven (quoted thus: *of.,* I, II,...); ¿) die *great series* of opuscula, numbering 69 (quoted *op.* 1, 2, 3...); c)a series supplementing the above groups (quoted: 3rd series; appendix in Vives ed.,). The Mandonnet edition contains the same texts in a more logical order. We quote the order of the opuscula according to the great current editions, since these are more easily referred to.

after St. Thomas' death by his secretary Raynald of Piperno, probably at the request of the General Chapter of 1274[1]. This catalogue, comprising seventy items, gave the name of opuscula only to the first twenty five. Within a short time a more complete series was formed by adding to the first group six of the remaining writings, supplemented by a seventh (hence a collection of *32 opuse.).* In the 14th century other supplementary collections were formed, but these are apocryphal. The first editors in the 16th century welcomed all indiscriminately. Mandonnet, relying on the official catalogue rejects the greater number of the additions to the 32 mentioned above[2]; of the ten that Grabmann[3] retains over and above, he accepts but two as being probably authentic. On the other hand he admits some few others that appear to be well sponsored[4].

The opuscula that are admitted by all critics, are here classified according to their subjects

1. Philosophical opuscula: to the ten already mentioned[5] (8 original op., and two commentaries: *De hebdomadibus* by Boethius, and *De causis)* may be added 1. *De regno* or *De regimine principum (op.* 16), political treatise in 4 books[6], dedicated (about 1265-1267) to the King of Cyprus, member of the Lusignan family; 2. the *De regimine Judaorum (op.* 17), an answer (1269-1272) to the Duchess of Brabant concerning various questions of an economic and social nature[7].

2. Theological opuscula:

1. op. 63 : Commentary *In Boetium de Trinitate* (1257-1258);
2. op. Vii : Commentary *In Dionysium de divinis nominibus* (after 1259);
3. op. 4 : Treatise *De articulis fidei et sacramentis* (1261-1262) ;
4. op. 2 : · — *De rationibus fidei* (Contra Græcos, Armenos, et Saracenos) (1261-1262);
5. op. vi : — *Contra erro)es Graecorum* (1261-1262) ;
6. op. i : *Compendium theologice (De fide et spe),* abridged manual of Theology dedicated to Raynald of Piperno (1272-1273).

1 Cf. Mandonnet, *Rev. th.,* 1927, p. 123-125.

3 The authority of this catalogue is also confirmed by the earliest manuscripts. *Ibid.,* p. 146 sq.

3 This critic relies rather on early catalogues other than the official catalogue, and still more on the tradition of the manuscripts.

4 Forty in all. Chronological list in Mandonnet, *Rev. th.,* 1927, p. 156-157.

5 See above, p. 542-543.

6 Left incomplete by St. Thomas; completed from bk 11, c. 4, by Ptolemy of Lucca. See below, p. 037.

7 J

1 Cf. PlRENNE, in *Revue nio-scol^* 1928. p. 193.2o ,

3. Moral and canonical questions: Answers to various enquiries : a) on two *decretals* (op. 19, 20 : about 1260) ; *b} De emptione et venditione* (op. 60: 1260); *d) De judiciis astrorum* and *De sortibus* (op. 21, 22 : 1269-1272); *d} Responsio de articulis XXXVI* and *Resp. de articulis VI* (op. 10, ii: 1271). There are three important responses by Thomas to the Master General of the Order : *a)* on the teaching of Peter of Tarentaise *(Resp. de CVIII articulis:* op. 8: after 1264); ¿) on various philosophical questions (op. 9 : *Resp. de XLII art.,* end of his life); Q on the form of absolution (op. 18; 1269-1272). The *Articuli iterum remissi* [1] a fragment of a letter in answer to questions put to him (3rd series). In the same series is found an answer to the Abbot of Monte Cassino, Bernard, which is probably St. Thomas' last writing (January-February 1274). To this collection of answers, containing all the Saint's correspondence, may be added an *Epistola de modo studendi,* which is very probably authentic (3rd series)[2].

4. Religious life and liturgy: The three treatises written in defence of the religious life have been already mentioned : 3[3] *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum* (op. I; 1257); *De perfectione vitee spiritualis* (op. u ; 1269) ; *Contra retrahentes a religionis ingressu* (op. m ; 1270). St. Thomas' liturgical work consists mainly in* the Office of *Corpus Christi (op.* V; 1264), composed at the request of Urban IV, and various prayers, probably authentic (3rd series), in addition to the *Adoro te* (or rather *Oro te devote}.* At the time of the institution of the Feast of the Blessed Sacrament St. Thomas pronounced a solemn discourse before the Consistory. This is one of the few oratorical extant works (3rd series).

5. Oratorical works. All that are extant consist almost wholly of *verbatim* reports of St. Thomas' sermons (several have been published and seem to be authentic ; 3rd series) and for the most part of *plans* and scanty outlines that are found among his opuscula. Thus, opusculum IV contains a series of 142 plans for *Sunday sermons* and another 83 for *various Jeastdays* (of Christ or the saints) : these instructions appear to date from the first years of his priesthood (1254-1264). In addition there is extant a summary of the last Lenten sermons he preached at Naples in 1273: he explained the ten *commandments* (op. 3), the *Pater* (op. 5), the *Ave* (op. 6), and the *Credo* (op. 7). All the texts are quite inadequate to provide any idea of the blessed doctor's eloquence. It is known that he could touch the heart of the people; it is related that on one occasion he had to interrupt his preaching on account of the tears of his listeners [4]. Lastly, we should mention the inaugural discourses given in 1252 and 1256 at'the opening of the Schools [5].

Other opuscula. The opuscula just mentioned are those regarded as authentic by Mandonnet; the remainder are to be rejected[6].

[1] Mandonnet, *Ecrits aulh.,* p. 137-139.
[2] Mandonnet, *Bibl. thorn.,* p. xvm. — [3] See above, p. 533, 538.
[4] Cf. H. Petitot, *5. Th. d'Aq.,* p. 142-145.
[5] Edited by F. Salvatore, *Due sermoni inediti di S. Tommaso dAq.,* Rome, 1912 (27 pages).
[6] The *De secreto* (Vives, vol. 32, p. 816) is simply a verbatim report oí a capitulan[7] meeting. Cf. Mandonnet, *Ecrits auth.,* p. 139-141.

Grabmann, as has been said, considers ten others to be authentic of which two are accepted by Mandonnet as probably authentic *.

Among those that are REJECTED BY all, some are of great length and importance, either philosophical *(De eruditione piincipum,* op. 37; *De totius logica Aristotelis sumina,* op. 44, in 8 treatises, etc...), or theological *(De venerabili sacramento altaris,* op. 51; *De sacramento eucharistia,* op. 52; *De humanitate Christi,* op. 53; *De dilectione Dei etproximi,* op. 54; etc.).

VI. SCRIPTURAL WORKS[1]

St. Thomas' writings on the Scriptures represent the labours of a lifetime and form a record of his teaching as master. He explained in turn the books of the Old and the New Testament. We possess his commentaries in two forms: *expositions* written entirely by the master himself, and the *lecture,* i. e., *transcriptions** of the master's oral teaching made by a listener chosen by him. The greater part of St. Thomas' extant exegetical work is in this latter form, notably his treatises on the Gospels and St. Paul [with the exception of the Epistle to the Romans and the 1st to the Corinthians as far as ch. vil], For a long period it was mistakenly believed that he had written a literal commentary on the four Gospels 4. In addition to the *Catena aurea* 5 which is not a commentary, but a *"Gloss"* (this is the appropriate term, as used by the early catalogues) and a collection of early passages on the sequence of Gospel texts 6, St. Thomas has left only two " lectures " on

1 *De fallaciis,* op. 35; *De propositionibus modalibus,* op. 36. The others retained by Grabmann are: *De differentia verbi divini et humani,* op. 12; *De verbo,* op. 13; *De principio individuationis,* op. 25; *De natura materia...* op. 28; *De instantibus,* op. 32; *De quatuor oppositis,* op. 33; *De demonstratione.* op. 34; *De natura accidentis,* op. 38; *De natura generis,* op. 39.

2 Vives ed., voi. 16-17 *(Catena aurea),* 1S-19 *(Old Test.},* 19-21 *(New Test.);* Panna cd., vol. 11-12 *(Catena);* v. 14 *(Old. T.);* io and 13 *(New T.).* MANDONNET, *La chronologie des écrits scripturaires de S. Th. d'Aq.,* in *Rev. th.,* 1928 and 1929.

3 The early catalogues expheity distinguish these two forms. See above, p. 471.

4 In the frequently copied early catalogue, a copyist erroneously substituted for the words: *2. Expositionem super "Job" ad litteram,* the following, 2. *Expositionem super " quatuor Evangelia ", ad litteram.* The words *quatuor Evangelia* are found in the preceding line, i. *Glossa super quatuor Evangelia,* and the scribe copied them inadvertently in the place of the word *Job* (thus erasing from the catalogue a known and well preserved work). See Fr. Sy NAVE, *Ix comment, sur les ./ Ev..* in *Mélanges th.,* p. 109-122. Cf. MANDONNET, *Chronologie, op. cit.,* 1929.

5 Corresponding to the lectures given between 1263-1267.

6 Cf. *Vie spirit.,* 1923 (vol. vu I), p. 462-464.

St, Matthew and St. John, and he does not appear to have explained the Gospel in any other way. On the other hand, he had the intention, while at Naples, to comment St. Paul for the second time, but death came to interrupt this task. Briefer but more numerous are his commentaries on the Old Testament: Isaías, Canticle, Lamentations, Jeremías, Job, and lastly the Psalms (54), all written by him, including the last, which was thought to have been merely transcribed.

The chronology of these commentaries, recently determined with rare penetration *, should be linked up with the diverse stages of St. Thomas' career as a professor :

a) Paris (1256-1259) : Isaías (exposit.); St. Matthew (lect.)

b) Italy (1259-1268) : Canticle a, Lamentations and Jeremías (Expos.); St. Paul (lecture : 1st explanation).

r) *Paris* (1269-1272) : Job (expos.); St. John (lect.).

it) Naples (1272-1273) : Psalms (expos.); St. Paul, 2nd (expos).

These data exactly correspond to the nature of the extant writings, except as regards St. Paul, for there remains but a single text, or rather the elements of the two texts, making together one single complete commentary: the first part (7>z *Rom.* and *In I Cor.,* ch. 1-vii, 9) is the exposition written by Thomas at Naples: what follows, on the end of the Epistle to the Corinthians from chapter XI (the commentary of v ii, io—X, 33, is taken from Peter of Tarentaise) and the other Epistles are from the transcriptions of his first teaching in Italy: this part was preserved to complete the work that was cut short by his death, whilst the remainder was abandoned 3.

These exegetical writings due to a master in theology, are, as is fitting, works of theology 4. St. Thomas, of course, affirms the need of first seeking the *literal meaning** and he himself endeavours to do so: this forms his preliminary work. " Once this meaning has been brought to light, he attempts to solve, relying on tradition and helped by reason, the difficulties that are raised by the "letter" and mainly—and it is to this that the difficulties and their solutions chiefly tend—to demonstrate its value as truth

'ByFR. Mandonnet, *op. cit.,* p. 240-245.

'The text remains to be found ; the authenticity of the two commentaries that have been edited is doubtful. Mandonnet, *Rev. th.,* 192S, p. 136 sq.

3 MANDONNET, *op. cit.,* Raynald de Piperno, who must have made these adaptations, had himself taken down after 1259, all St. Thomas' scriptural lectures that had not been written. With Mandonnet we may believe that Thomas conceived the idea of these transcriptions and asked the help of his devoted "socius".

4 See A. Gardeil, *Les procédés exégétiques de S. Th.,* in *Rev. th.,* 1903, p. 428-457. P. Synave, *Les commentaires scripturaires de S. Th. d Aq.* in *Vic spirit.,* 1923 (vol. vni), p. 455-469.

A

in relation to a general conception of God and creatures, and with regard to human life" l. He "invariably interprets in a sense that is favourable to the faith", the opinions of the Fathers that are apt to give rise to discussion. " Such a method possesses the great advantage of providing not only the strict literal explanation of the sacred text, but also its traditional commentary, penetrated with the century-old thought of the great Doctors. Provided that one is not repelled by the many subdivisions that break up the ideas of the sacred writers into their numerous and proper elements, these will be found to be invested with the charm that accompanied their original revelation or divine inspiration, and set in a wisely ordered theological system"2.

Saint Thomas' doctrinal interests led him to seek, beyond what was signified by the letter, " other hidden realities, equally intended by God : the ancient law is the shadow of the new; the actions of Christ show what we ourselves must carry out: the life of the Church Militant foreshadows that of the Church Triumphant. In an attempt to uncover these three senses, *allegorical, inorai* and *anagogica!,* that are found either together or separately behind the literal signification 3, St. Thomas brought to bear all the light of his synthetical mind, and all the resources of contemporary learning. A mere glance at his commentaries suffices to reveal the almost overwhelming wealth of applications suggested by the sacred texts...— *The spiritual life* that finds its delights in browsing on the very words of the inspired authors, in savouring their traditional flavour and extracting their theological essence must surely find a rare banquet in these scriptural commentaries of Thomas Aquinas" 4.

ARTICLE III. THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA.

I. GENERAL CHARACTER.

" The *Summa theologica,* considered as a whole, forms the most extensive and the clearest systematic development of all Thomist theology", yet the author's intention was

* P. Synave, *ibid.,* p. 457. —2 *Ibid.,* p. 458.
3 Cf. *Quodlibet,* VII, a. 15, ad 5. See also *Sum. theol.,* I», q. 1, a. 10.
4 P. Synave, *ibid.,* p. 458-459.

to provide a summary introduction to the whole of speculative theology rather than a complete and exhaustive work ». In the *Piologite,* St. Thomas points out that in theology as well as in the practice of virtue there are "beginners" and the " proficient " and states that in the present work he intends especially to instruct the former, novices in theology *(doctrina novitii),* children in need of milk rather than solid food *(i Cor.,* ill, **i**)2. To this didactic element is added another general characteristic that was to distinguish Thomas' work from all previous *summay* i. e., the use of Aristotelian philosophy in the systematic and rational explanation of dogma and moral, without any intrinsic modification of the traditional teaching of the Church3.

The desire of showering on theology the benefits of Aristotle's philosophy, was not, however, St. Thomas' main purpose in composing this work: he wanted to provide a clear, brief, and precise teaching. He was careful to avoid three defects that lay heavily on earlier Summæ: futility, unordered planning, and prolixity 4. He therefore left to one side many secondary questions and limited himself only to indispensable arguments in those that he treated. He so arranged the vast subject matter that repetition was avoided, and the most profound metaphysical concepts linked each part with its very diverse elements 5. In no other of his works does St. Thomas so reveal his genius "formed by an equal aptitude for analysis and synthesis" 6.

The analytical method was usual in the Schools. The Angelic Doctor conformed admirably to it, not only in questions of a speculative nature but also in the field of observation and practice. " In the speculative sciences where deduction holds exclusive sway, he defines, divides and infers with consummate mastery, but always within reason, avoiding the contrary pitfalls of hesitancy and subtility"7. In the psychological domain he observed finely and surely " the whole life of the soul: conscience, as well as the internal faculties and operations, whether he treated of passions and emotions, or of the intelligence and the will"8. But St. Thomas' veritable triumph in analysis is found

' M. Grabmann, *La Somme théol.,* p. 39-40.

3 Propositum nostræ intentionis in hoc opere est ea quæ ad Christianam religionem pertinent eo modo tradere secundum quod congruit ad eruditionem incipientium.

3M. Grabmann, *ibid.,* p. 61-72. — 4 See the *Prologue.*

5 M. Grabmann explains at length these various advances made by the Thomist method. *Op. cit.,* p. 73-134.

6 Mandonnet, *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 878.

1 *Ibid.,* col. 878. — 8 *Ibid.,* col. 878-879.

in his treatment of moral subjects: " He dissects moral and social facts, fully aware that he was in mixed company, where material events are guided by lofty general principles, but in which also, facts and experience take on a far-reaching significance "[1]. Thanks to his great gifts the Angelic Doctor was able to treat of the virtues in the IP-II® with incomparable mastery.

Despite the predominant analytical method, the Summa is rightly termed a synthesis, first on account of the outstanding metaphysical insight that dictated the general arrangement of the whole as well as the demonstration of the theses and the solution of difficulties, and which maintains an unbroken unity throughout the greatest variety of subject matter. " *The ability for synthesis* in St. Thomas is perhaps no greater than his power of analysis, but since it is a rarer gift it strikes us more forcibly"[2]. To this latter gift the Angelic Doctor owed an extraordinary intuitive faculty together with a genius for judicious arrangement. He was acquainted with almost all that had been produced by the best minds of his predecessors and those of his own time; but instead of allowing himself to be overwhelmed by all this accretion of the past, he drew from it with apparently no effort, a personal and original work, containing the purest essence of this traditional bequest. While making a clear distinction between philosophy, theology and mysticism, he condensed in this single work the essentials of dogmatic and moral theology, asceticism and mysticism, and even philosophy. The Summa is truly a synthesis, theoretical (to instruct was the author's immediate purpose) and summary, since it was intended for beginners, but it is nevertheless a synthesis that takes in all the main branches of sacred learning.

The scheme of the general division is as imposing as it is simple. In any theological summa *God* must be the main object. But here God is considered under three aspects, from three different angles:

1.He is first studied as *Being,* not only *in se* but also *extra se,* inasmuch as He is the source of all things: " Principalis intentio hujus sacræ doctrinæ est *Dei cognitionem tradere,* et non solum *secundum quod in se est,* sed etiam *secundum quod est principium rerum* " (Ia, q. 2). Hence the treatises *de Deo* and *de operibus Dei.*

2.God is then considered as the *Good,* i. e., as the end of created beings and especially of rational beings "*finis earum* et specialiter rationalis creaturæ"; hence the study "de motu rationalis creaturæ in Deum " (Ibid.),

3.Lastly, God is seen as the *Way* of man to God, not man as such, but as fallen man, who needed an incarnate God Who "via est nobis tendendi in Deum " (Ibid). Hence the three parts of the Summa.

[1] *Ibid.,* col. 879. — [2] *Ibid.,* col. 879.

IL BRIEF ANALYSIS.

It is obviously impossible here to give a summary of such a work, but it will not be profitless to draw up a somewhat detailed inventory of the wealth it encloses and classify its elements according to the author's own indications. This is rendered all the more necessary by the fact that nowadays these diverse elements are dispersed, being attributed to sharply distinct branches of learning; philosophy, moral theology, dogma, spirituality. Though it is needful to re-establish each text in its immediate context, it is no less necessary to place each treatise and question exactly where it belongs in the vastness of the Summa. This framework puts them in their true background and enables us, for the most part, to determine the guiding thought of the author. In the following article, we give for each treatise, the capital and truly characteristic theses of Thomist theology, according to the arrangement of the Summa. In the present article a simple analysis of this work must suffice.

A). Prima Pars (119 questions).

After the 1st question consisting of a general Introduction to theology [1] St. Thomas states that the *Prima* is a general study of God *(De Deo).* God is here considered not from every viewpoint but simply as Being, or the principle (or exemplar) [2] of being [3]. Yet the subject, even thus limited, is immense and fills three great treatises: 1. *De Deo uno* (q. 2-26); 2. *De Deo trino* (q. 27-43); 3. *De Deo creante et gubernante* (q. 44-119) [4].

1. De Deo uno (q. 2-26)[5].

This treatise comprises three parts of unequal length treating of the existence of God (q. 2), His essence (q. 3-13), and His operations (q. 14-26).

ii) The existence of God[6] is established briefly yet thoroughly in a single question of three articles (q. 2).

1 See art. iv, p. 577.

2 See the *Prologue* to the iia-næ.

3 In the IIa God is considered as End.

4 Consideratio autem *de Deo* tripartita erit: 1. considerabimus ea quæ ad essentiam divinam pertinent; 2. ea quæ pertinent ad distinctionem personarum; 3. eaquæ pertinent ad processum creaturarum ab ipso.

5 Trans, by English Dominicans, and Sertillanges, *Traili de Dieu,* 3 vols (Coll. *Revue des [tunes').*

6 See art. in, p. 5S5.

b) The treatise on the ESSENCE OF God (q. 3-13), though not perhaps showing what He is, at least points out what He is not[1], for from the divine essence must be removed I. all composition, since it is *simple* (q. 3), and this gives us some idea of God's perfection and goodness, (q. 4-6) ; 2. all limits, by declaring it to be *infinite* (q. 7), from which its omnipresence and ubiquity naturally follows (q. 8); 3. all movement by recognising it to be *immovable* (q. 9), and hence eternal (q. 10); lastly, all essential multiplicity, by showing it to be *one* (q. 11). This demonstration is rounded off with two important questions dealing with the knowledge that man can acquire with regard to God (q. 12), and by what names He may be called (q. 13).

c) The Divine operations studied at this juncture (q. 14-26), are knowledge and will, which remain in the agent, and power which produces works *ad extra*[2]. 1. To the question on divine *knowledge* (q. 14) and ideas (q. 15) is connected a study not only of truth (q. 16) and, in this instance, of falsehood (q. 17), but also of life (q. 18), for "a certain act of comprehension is life "[3]. 2. To the divine *will* (q. 19) is irrevocably linked up divine love (q. 20) as well as justice and mercy (q. 21), whilst providence (q. 22) and predestination (q. 23-24), pertain to the intelligence and will combineci. 3. The divine *power* (q. 25), is sovereignly active and limitless. This treatise on the nature of God comes to an end with a question devoted to divine *happiness* (q. 26).

2. De Deo trino (q. 27-43).

St. Thomas begins his demonstration with two masterly introductory questions concerning the *processions* (q. 27) and the *relations* (q. 28) in God: with question 29 he comes to the study of the persons; this consists of two parts: *a)* the persons *in se* (q. 29-38); ¿) their various relations (q. 39-43).

a} The persons in se (q. 29-38) are first considered *generally,* making precise: 1. the meaning of the word person in God (q. 29); 2. lhe distinction of the persons in God (q. 30) ; 3. the significance of the expressions that designate their unity and plurality (q. 31): 4. lastly, the reality of lhe "notions" or character proper to distinguish the persons (q. 32). Then follows a *special study* on each one, the Father (q. 33), the Son (q. 34-35), the Holy Ghost (q. 36-38).

¿) The various relations (q. 39-43) that may be considered among lhe persons, allow them to be compared, either with the divine essence (d. 39), hence the question of words to be used ; or with the relations or properties (q. 40); or with lhe notional acts (generation and spiration) (q. 41). When the persons are compared among themselves, on the one hand must be recognised their equality and resemblance (q. 42), and on the other hand the existence of true *missions* (d. 43). The treatise ends with this question.

[1] Cognito de aliquo an sit, inquirendum restat *quomodo sit,* ut sciatur de eo quid sit. Sed quia de Deo scire non possumus quid sit, sed quid non sit, non possumus considerare de Deo quomodo sit sed potius quomodo non sit. Ergo considerandum est quomodo non sit (q. 3-II), quomodo a nobis cognoscatur (q. 12), quomodo nominetur (q. 13).

Operatio quædam est quæ manet in operante, quædam vero quæ procedit in exteriorem effectum. — [3] Intelligere quoddam est vivere.

3. De Deo creante et gubernante (q. 44-119).

After the Trinity, St. Thomas studies the way in which creatures "proceed" from God'; he speaks successively *a)* of creation (q. 44-49); ¿) of the various works of creation (q. 50-102); *c)* of the government of created things (q. 103-119).

a) The CREATION (q. 44-49) 1 is pre-eminently the *production* of beings: theology shows us their cause (q. 44), the way in which they proceed (q. 45), the principle of their duration (q. 46). It also seeks thé principle of the *distinction* of beings (q. 47), and notably the origin of good and evil in the world (q. 48-49).

l>) The various works of God (q. 50-102), may be reduced to three groups : purely spiritual creatures, or angels; purely corporeal creation, constituting the universe; and the being composed of body and spirit, man2.

1. Angels (q. 50-64)3 are first treated with regard to their substance (q. 5°-53), their intelligence (54-58), their will (59-60); their creation (q. 61), and raising to a supernatural state (q. 62); fallen angels (q. 63-64).

2. The material world is studied in the work of the six days of creation or *hexaemeron* (q. 65-74). St. Thomas first considers the work of creation in general, calling it the *opus creationis* (q. 65-66) to distinguish it from the work of the first three days, *opus distinctionis* (q. 67-69) and the work of the three following days, *opus ornatus* (q. 70-72). He concludes with considerations on the 7th day (q. 73) and the hexaemeron as a whole (q. 74).

3. Man (q. 75-102) says St. Thomas, holds an interest for the theologian only inasmuch as he possesses a soul4, and he therefore explains the *nature* of man (75-89), before speaking of his creation (q. 90-102). While on this subject he treats successively of the spiritual essence of the soul (q. 75-76), its faculties (q. 77-78), especially the intellect (q. 79) and the *appetitus,* mainly will and freewill (q. 80-83)5. Only the *acts* and the *habitus* of the intellect and will are matter for the theologian6; those pertaining to the will form the subject of a later treatise7; the operations of the intellect alone are treated here (q. 84-89). The *creation* of the first man is considered from various angles: production in the true sense of the term (q. 90-92); special resemblance to God (q. 93) ; natural and supernatural state of the soul (q. 94-96) and also of the body and even the species (q. 97-101); lastly the place of creation or the earthly paradise (q. 102).

1 Considerandum restat de processione creaturarum a Deo.

2 New trans. Sertillanges, *Traité de la Création,* (coll. *Revue des Jeunes).*

3 See quaest. 50.

4 The *treatise on angels* comprises in addition, 9 questions dealing with their functions in the divine government of the creation. See below, q. 106-114.

5 Naturam autem hominis considerare pertinet ad theologum ex parte animæ, non autem ex parte corporis, nisi secundum habitudinem quam habet corpus ad animam. — 6 New trans. WÉBERT, *Traité de Pâme humaine* (Coll. *Rev. Jeun.}.*

7 Consequenter considerandum est de actibus et de habitibus animæ quantum ad potentias intellectivas et appetitivas; aliæ enim potentiæ non pertinent directe ad considerationem theologi. — 8 See the ia-næ, q. 6-48.

c) The Divine government of creation (q. 103-119) is often carried out by *direct* and immediate *action* (q. 103-105) but it also makes use of the operation of created things. 1. The *angels* (q. 106-114) act not only on other angels (q. 106-107), for such is the manner of their hierarchy (q. 108) and even on devils (q. 109), but on material bodies (q. 110) and on men (q. in-112): especially important is the operation of the guardian angels (q. 113), and devils (q. 114). 2. *Material bodies* also have their operations (q. 115) and by these is explained fatality (q. 116). Lastly, *man* is able to influence other beings both as regards the spirit (q. 117) and the flesh (q. 118-119). The First Part conies to an end with a cry of praise to God, Who is "super omnia benedictus Deus in sæcula sæculorum. Amen."

B). Secunda Pars (i 14 and 189 questions).

The subject of the Second Part is the study of man in his relations with God, no longer as having received his existence from God the Creator or as an image of the eternal Exemplar, but inasmuch as he is free and master of his actions *(Prologue).* In other words, God is here to be considered as the last end of man, for all the activity of free creatures must tend to God as St. Thomas shows in the little treatise *de beatitudine* (q. 1-5) which forms an introduction to all the Secunda, a study in *moral theology.* At the beginning of question 6, the latter is subdivided into *general moral theology* constituting the first section (ia-ilæ), and *special moral theology,* the subject of the second section (na¾II

Prima Secundæ (i 14 questions).

After the *introduction,* dealing with beatitude or the final goal of man's activity (q. 1-5) St. Thomas immediately begins to treat of the latter. This study is concerned with acts in themselves (q 6-48), their intrinsic principles (q. 49-89) and their extrinsic principles (90-114).

I. The acts. They are of two kinds: human acts in the tine sense of the word (q. 6-21) and passions (q. 22-48) that are common to man and to animals.

«) Human acts (q. 6-21)[1] which are mainly acts of the will (q. 6), though they are bound up with certain circumstances (q. 7), are first to be divided, from a psychological point of view (q. 8-17), into elicited and commanded acts. Acts *elicited* by the will itself tend either directly to the end or the good, or the means for obtaining it. Those that tend to the end are: 1. simple willing, *velle* (q. 8), or the act of the will *moved by* a good object (q. 9-10); 2. the enjoyment of the good acquired, ***fruì*** (q. 11); the tendency towards this good, *intendere* (q. 12). Those that centre round the means (ea quæ sunt ad finem) are: 1. choice (q. 13) which implies counsel (q. 14); 2. consent (q. 15); 3. execution or application (q. 16). In addition to these acts that are peculiar

[1] New trans. Gilliet, *Traiti des actes humains* (Coll. *Revue des felines}*

to it, the will is able to move other faculties to produce the acts that are proper to them, and these are then termed *commanded* acts (q. 17). These distinctions lead to one that is still more important, the moral distinction *good and evil acts:* this morality is first studied in general (q. 18), then in the interior act (q. 19), and the external act (q. 20), and lastly in its consequences (q. 21).

b) The passions (q. 22-48) after a general outline (q. 22-25), are dealt with in particular: first, those of the *concupiscible appetite:* r love (q. 26-28) and hate (q. 29); 2. desire and aversion (concupiscentia et fuga) (q. 30); 3. delight or joy (q. 31-34) and sadness (q. 35-39); then follow those *of* the *irascible appetite:* 1. hope and despair (q. 40); 2. fear (q. 41-44) and audacity (q. 45); 3. lastly, anger (q. 46-48).

2. The intrinsic principles of acts (q. 49-89) are the *faculties* and the *habitus.* The faculties having been studied in the First Part (q. 77-83) only the habitus remain to be treated.

The habitus IN general (q. 49-54) are first considered in themselves (q. 49) or in the faculty they make perfect (q. 50), then in their cause, origin, progress and decline (q. 51-53 and lastly, distinguished (q. 54). Their classification into good habitus or *virtues* (with which are connected the *gifts},* and evil habitus or *vices,* occupies the remainder of the treatise.

«) The virtues (q. 55-67) are studied more deeply than the habitus, since they constitute the veritable basis of special moral theology (IIMI®), which is founded on the great virtues. After having stated some general data (q. 55-56) St. Thomas distinguishes: 1. the *intellectual* virtues (q. 57) ; 2. the *moral* virtues (q. 58-59) which he reduces to the four cardinal virtues (q. 60-61); 3. the *theological* virtues (q. 62). Hethen treats of their *cause* (q. 63), whence the distinction into natural and infused virtues, and lastly their properties: the golden mean, connection, inequality and duration (q. 64-67).

The gifts of the Holy Ghost (q. 68) are habitus essentially distinct from even the infused virtues ; they form the principles of perfect acts, termed *beatitudes* (q. 69) or *fruits* (70)1. Both the latter are nowadays especially treated in mystical and ascetic3 theology; St. Thomas however likens them to the virtues, and studies them at the same time3.

b} Vices (q. 71-89) are the habitual principles of *sins* and evil actions, and these are studied by St. Thomas mainly in the first question (q. 71), while sins are treated *in se* in q. 72-74 and in their general causes in q. 75. The *internal* causes are ignorance, weakness and malice (q. 76-78). Their *external* causes cannot certainly be God (q. 79), but either the devil (q. 80) or man: hence the study of *original sin* which we derive from Adam (q. 81-83). Sins may also be the cause of other sins, especially those that are called *capital sins* or *vices* (q. 84). Sin *results* in the degradation of the soul, stain or defilement, and punishment (q. 85-87), effects that differ considerably accordingly as sin is mortal or venial (q. 88-89).

' See below, p. 613.
3 See below, p. 619.
3 See the na-næ.

3. The extrinsic principles of good acts[1] (q. 90-114) may be reduced to the *law* by which God teaches us, and *grace* by which He aids even our innermost actions.

λ) The law (q. 90-108) is first considered from a general point of view, in its nature (q. 90), its kinds (q. 91) and its effects (q. 92). St. Thomas then treats of each kind of law separately, the *eternal* law (q. 93), *natural* law (q. 94), *human* positive law (q. 95-97), the *old divine* law (q. 98-105), and the *new divine* law (q. 106-108).

b) Grace (q. 109-114)[3] is accorded but a brief treatment in the Summa. Having shewn its *necessity* (q. 109) St. Thomas explains its nature or *essence* (q. no), and its *kinds* (q. in); it is *produced* by God alone (q. 112) and possesses two main *effects:* the actual justification of the sinner (q. 113) and the possibilty of true merit before God, resulting from the good actions of the just man (q. 114).

Secunda Secundæ (189 questions).

With the exception ot the last questions (q. 171-189) concerning various states of life, the greater part of the IIa-næ is devoted *to general moral obligations,* grouped around the *theological virtues* (q. 1-46). and the *cardinal virtues* (q. 47-170). St. Thomas treats at length of the *nature* of each virtue (its object, acts, the faculty it perfects)[3], *the gift cf the Holy Ghost* corresponding to it, the *vices* or sins that destroy it, and lastly the *precepts* that concern it. He insists especially however on the nature of the virtues, and the better to define that of the cardinal virtues, he seeks with reference to each one, the elements *(partes integrales)* that compose it, and the species *(partes subjectiva)* that are contained formally in the object of these virtues, and lastly, the complementary virtues *(partes potentiates)* that may be linked up with them. By means of this wide co-ordination St. Thomas has established in this infinitely complex world of moral habits a powerful theoretical unity, reflecting the practical unity set up in the soul by the virtue of charity and the gift of wisdom that renders it perfect.

i. Theological Virtues (q. 1-46).

The *classification* of the virtues and vices is particularly instructive as may be seen from the following brief summary.

a) Faith (q. 1-16) is a virtue by means of which the mind adheres with great constancy to the truths that the First Truth reveals to us. To faith are connected the *gifts of understanding* and *knowledge:* the gift of understanding (q. 8) is an intellectual gift that permits a higher, though still imperfect comprehension of these same truths. The gift of knowledge (q. 9) is a gift enriching the speculative judgment in the light of supernatural truths with regard to created beings. The *vices* opposed to faith are infidelity, heresy, apostasy, blasphemy (q. 10-14). To understanding are opposed wilful ignorance and stubbornness (hebetudo) (q. 15).

b} Hope (q. 17-22), the awaiting of eternal happiness in the possession of God, as promised by God Himself, is connected with the *gift of fear*

: l· or the devil as principle of evil acts, see the previous paragraph.
* New trans. Mulard, *l raiti de la grâce* (Coll. *Rev. Jeunes).* — 3 Subjectum.

(π. 19) that makes the soul careful not to displease God, by means ot a filial affection that rules out all worldly or servile fear. It is destroyed by *two vices:* despair and presumption (q. 20-21).

ή Charity (q. 23-46) is defined by St. Thomas : *a friendship* between man and God *. This general definition is made more exact by a study of charity from a subjective (q. 23-24) and an objective (q. 25-26) viewpoint, and especially by determining the chief *act* that is *peculiar* toit. This act is love *(dilectio)* (q. 27). Dilection is not merely good-will, a simple act of the will following on a reasoned judgment: it also entails a certain affective tendency.

Some of the *effects* of charity are internal (joy, peace, mercy), others external (charitable works, almsgiving, fraternal correction) (q. 28-33).

The *vices* opposed to charity are: hate (q. 34), sloth *(acedia)* " tristitia de bono divino de quo caritas gaudet" (q. 35), envy (q. 36), discord (q· 37)i contention (q. 38), the spirit of contradiction (q. 39), war (q. 40), quarrels (q. 41), rebelliousness (q. 42), scandal (q. 43).

The *gift* corresponding to charity is *wisdom* (q. 45), to which is opposed *stultitia,* langour of the supernatural feeling, and *fatuitas,* the very negation of this feeling (q. 46).

2. The Cardinal Moral Virtues (q. 47-170).

λ) Prudence (q. 47-56)* is the only moral virtue that directly perfects the reason, and this simply in its practical judgments (recta ratio agibiliuin). The *acts* it entails are counsel, judgment and mainly imperium, which, says Sertillanges 3, St. Thomas treats as a genius (q. 47, art. 8).

The *elements* or internal conditions of prudence are (q. 49), memory, understanding, aptitude for learning (docilitas), swiftness in taking action (solertia) deductive reason, capability of foreseeing and planning the future (providentia) circumspection and caution.

Accordingly as its object varies, prudence may be: royal, political, domestic, military (p. 50). With prudence are connected: 1. the natural gift of counsel *(eubulia),* 2. common sense *(synesis)* ; and 3. right judgment in making necessary exceptions *(gnome)* (q. 51).

By means of the *gift of counsel,* the Holy Ghost guides the reason, modo divino, in making its practical judgments (q. 52).

The *vices* opposed to prudence are: by *omission* (q. 53-54) imprudence and negligence, and by *excess* (q. 55), the prudence of the flesh, astuteness, and uneasiness.

b) Justice (q. 57-122) is dealt with at length. First in its general elements: right, q. 57; the object of justice, according as it is divided into *general* (also called *legal}* or *special* justice (q. 58): injustice (q. 59), lastly, judgment (q. 60). Special justice is studied at length (q. 61-120) and the whole explanation ends with questions devoted to the gift of piety and the precepts relating to justice (q. 121-122).

' On *friendship* in general, see Sertillanges, *La philos, morale de S. Th.* 337-407. The author makes use of many passages concerning charity from the Summa.

' New trans. Noble, *Le traité de la Prudence* (Coll. *Revue des Jeunes).*

3 *Op. cil.,* p. 221. See farther, p. 599.

The general data relative to special justice concern: *a)* its kinds; distributive and commutative justice, q. 6i,and at this point the author speaks *of* restitution, q. 62; *b)* its integral parts, q. 79; ¿j its potential elements and connected virtues, q. 80.

The two KINDS of special justice lead St. Thomas to make a detailed study of the acts contrary to distributive justice (q. 63) and especially commutative justice (q. 64-78), violated by attacks on the life, person and possessions of others, q. 64-66; by rash judgments q. 67-71; by moral offenses, q. 72-76; lastly by fraud and trickery, q. 77-78.

Among the nine CONNECTED virtues (q. 80-120) a special place must be given to religion, which is here treated at length.

Religion, a virtue connected with justice (q. 81-100) is also the first moral virtue, since it leads us to render to God the honour and veneration that are due to Him. Its acts are six in number. First the interior acts:

1. *devotion* (q. 82) tending to make the will render to God the worship that is His due (a. 1); it is a fruit of meditation and contemplation (a. 3) and a source of spiritual joy (a. 4).

2. *frayer* (q. 83) is studied in 17 articles forming a complete and substantial treatise.

The virtue of *fenance* should have been dealt with here, but St. Thomas reserves it for the mrd part where he speaks of the Sacrament *of* Penance.

The remaining acts of religion are concerned with *external worship:* adoration (q. 84), sacrifice (q. 85), offering (q. 86), firstfruits (q. 87), and various special acts, vows (q. 88), oaths (q. 89), adjuration (q. 90), and praise (q. 91). To these three latter exterior acts of latria are connected the sacraments (q. 89), studied in the Tertia.

Sins against religion are dealt with in questions 92-100.

The other virtues connected with justice relate to our fellow-creatures: they are numerous:

1. piety (q. 101) is a manifestation of one's love for parents and country.

2. respect (observantia, q. 102) by which we give to superiors: *a)* the honour they deserve (dulia, q. 103); *b)* obedience to their orders (q. 104-105).

3. gratitude (q. 106-107) and vengeance (q. 108) concern the rendering to others the good or evil received from them.

4. veracity (q. 109) forbids lying, hypocrisy, boasting and irony (q. 110-113).

5. affability (q. 114) is opposed to flattery and quarrelsomeness (q. 115-116).

6. liberality (q. 117) excludes avarice (q. 118) and prodigality (q. 119).

7. epikeia (q. 120) is the norm of extra-legal equity.

The *gift of piety* (q. 121) really corresponds to justice since by it, "cultum et officium exhibemus Deo ut patri per instinctum Spiritus Sancti" and causes us to give this veneration not only to God but also "omnibus hominibus in quantum pertinent ad Deum".

The *precepts* concerning justice are mainly contained in the Ten Commandments (q. 122).

c) Fortitude [1] (q. 123-140) has two acts peculiar to it: i) to undertake "moderate *aggredi* cohibendi timores" (q. 123, a. 3); 2) to support: "*sustinere* (immobiliter sistere in periculis) moderando audaciam " (a. 6).

Martyrdom (q. 124) is a heroic and extraordinary act of fortitude.

The *idees* opposed to fortitude are fear (q. 125), temerity and audacity (q. 126-127).

Since fortitude has a very particular object it has no *derived species;* four virtues however are connected with it ; two concern the "aggredi ", the others the " sustinere " :

j. magnanimity (q. 129) lead man "ad ea quæ sunt digna magno honore", without presumption (q. 130) nor ambition (q. 131) nor pride (q. 132) nor pusillanimity (q. 133) ;

2. magnificence (q. 134) leads to the carrying out of noble enterprises and the avoidance of meanness (parvicentia, q. 135) ;

3. patience (q. 136) tempers sadness and has longanimity for its fellow ;

4. perseverance (q. 137) and constancy react against the difficulties deriving respectively " ex diuturnitate actus " and " ab exterioribus impedimentis ".

To perseverance are opposed : indolence and stubbornness (pertinacitas, q. 138).

By the *gift ojfortitude* (q. 139) the Holy Ghost infuses into the soul a confidence (quamdam fiduciam), that excludes all fear.

ïi] Temperance[2] (q. 141-170) inasmuch as it defiers from fortitude, moderates the passions that lend to concupiscence and pleasure (q. 141). To this virtue are opposed callousness anc intemperance (q. 142).

Its *conditions* are virtuous shame (verecundia, q. 144) and decorum (q. 145). Its *object* is to restrain the unbridled greed for food (abstinence: q. 146-148), drink (sobriety: q. 149-150) and carnal pleasures (chastity and virginity: q. 151-154). There are thus *three kinds* of temperance.

The connected virtues[3] are:

1. continence (q. 155-156) here taken to mean the virtue that controls the natural instincts of the body, though not establishing the perfect order implied by temperance ;

2. clemency (q. 157-159) tempers the onset of anger;

3. humility (q. 161) moderates the rising of pride (q. 162-165).

4. studiousness (q. 166) curbs the excess of curiosity (q. 167);

5. modesty is the rule of external behaviour and politeness in recreation (eutrapelia, q. 168) as well as restraint in dress (q. 169). The term *modesty* is also understood in a wider sense (q. 160) covering all the three virtues just mentioned; humility, studiousness and modesty in the strict meaning of the word.

3. Special Gifts and States (q. 171-189).

[1] New trans. FOLGHERA, *Traiti de la Force* (Coll. *Revue des Jeunes).*

[2] *Id., La Tempérance* (Coll. *Revue des Jeunes).*

[3] The gift indicated by St. Thomas as corresponding to the virtue of temperance is the gift of *fear* (q. 141.a. 1 ad 3).

λ) The gifts that are treated here are *graces "gratis data"* (q. 171-178) or exceptional favours, distinct from the graces that sanctify: [1] they are prophecy (q. 171-174), ravishment, (q. 175), the gifts of tongues (q. 176) the gift of eloquence (q. 177) and the gift of miracles (q. 178).

b) Two very different states of life are seen in the *active* and the *contemplative life* (q. 179-182) between which it is should observed that there is a greater divergence of ends *(studia)* than of action and works[2].

c) The STATES OF LIFE (q. 183-189) may be distinguished from various viewpoints (q. 183) and even the state of the *perfect*[3] has many degrees (q. 184). Both *bishops* (q. 185) and *religious* (q. 186-189) are in the state of perfection, though for different reasons. At this juncture St. Thomas gives some description of the religious life (q. 186) indicates the rights and duties of its members (q. 187), the different forms in which it is found (q. 188) and the conditions for entrance therein (q. 189). This long development is to be explained by the pressing need of a refutation, based on a full explanation of principles, of the adversaries of the active Orders which were especially attacked in the XIIIth century[4]. The Secunda ends with a form of praise, similar to that which terminates the Prima, here addressed to Our Lord Jesus Christ, "qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in sæcula. Amen".

C). Tertia Pars (90 questions).

The Third Part treats of God inasmuch as He is *our way:* Christ showed us the way by His Incarnation and all its consequences, first in Himself *(in seipso)* and also in the *benefits* that come from Him, even to beatitude and the immortal life to which He leads us [5]. The division is as follows: I. Christ fq. 1-59); 2. the Sacraments (q. 60 sq.); 3. the Last Things.

I. Christ (q. 1-59).

The study of Christ comprises two parts, both theological, concerning λ) the mystery of the Incarnation (q. 1-26); *b}* the mysteries of the life of Christ (q. 27-57).

«) The mystery of Christ (q. 1-26) first raises a question on the *fittingness* of the Incarnation (q. 1) but mainly calls the theologian's attention to the *nature of the union*[6] between God and man that takes place in Christ: such is the subject of questions 2-15 and especially of the first five in which St. Thomas considers the union itself (q. 2), the divine person that unites itself to human nature (q. 3), and the nature assumed by God (q. 4-6). But the extraordinary privilege granted

[1] See below, p. 609 — [3] See *Ascetic theology,* p. 618.

[3] The obligations of the other states are sufficiently indicated by the foregoing general data.

[4] New trans, of the last questions (179-1S9) by LeMONNYER, *Traité de la vii humaine* (Coll. *Revue desfumes).* — [5] Prologue to the HIa. Cf. Ia, q. 2.

[6] New trans. Herís, *Le Verbe incarné* (Coll. *Revue des feunes).*

to such a nature raises problems that need immediate solution: what are the properties of the assumed nature *(assumpta)?* Questions 7-15 deal with its perfections (grace, q. 7-8 ; knowledge, q. 9-12; power, q. 13) and its weaknesses (q. 14-15). Having established the nature of the union, St. Thomas endeavours to furnish a deeper understanding of the mystery, drawing from the principles he has stated various *consequences,* by studying Christ in Himself (in His being and operations, q. 16-19), comparing Him with the Father (hence the questions on His obedience, 20, His prayer, 21, His priesthood, 22, His adoption, 23, His predestination, 24) and lastly by considering His relation to us, he shows what rights He has to our worship (q. 25) and His rôle as mediator (q. 26).

b') The life of Christ [1] (q. 27-59) is treated in four stages : 1. *His coming into the world* (q. 27-39) which leads St. Thomas to speak of *Our lady* and her privileges (q. 27-30), then of her virginal conception (q. 31-34) and lastly of the childhood of Jesus and His baptism (q. 35-39); 2. *His presentation to the world* in His public life (q. 40-45 : His mode of life, temptation, teaching, miracles) ; 3. *His going out ofthe world* (q. 46-52 : passion, death, burial, descent into hell) ; 4. lastly, His *exaltation* and life of glory (q. 53-59: resurrection, ascension, place at the right hand of the Father, power of judgment).

2. The Sacraments (q. 60-90).

Though unfinished this treatise is extremely valuable. First, the *general fart* (q. 60-65) which benefited by the advance made on this subject during the Middle Ages and gave it its final form. The study of the sacraments of *baptism* (q. 66-71) *confirmation* (q. 72) and the *Eucharist* (q. 73-83), is complete, and the latter may be considered as the testament of the Angelic Doctor: it was the last complete treatise he penned. *Penance* (q. 84-90) is studied from 6 viewpoints: the questions that treat of its nature (as sacrament and as virtue) (q. 84-85) and its effects (q. 86-89) «'done were completed. Question 90, which begins to treat of the parts or elements of penance, deals only with the general aspect of the subject (a. 1-4). The great theological masterpiece remained unfinished [2].

III. THE USES OF THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA[3].

The foregoing summary reveals the incomparable wealth of the Summa theologica. Its theoretical tone should not lead us to think it useful merely as a school text-book. Its didactic *qualities,* of course, give to it an outstanding place in theological teaching, both now as in the past. But its *practical value* also has always been recognised by spiritual directors, who have had recourse to it for a sure spiritual

1 New trans. Synave, *Vie deJésus (ibid.).*

2 Raynald of Piperno is the author of the supplement (Mandonnet, *Ecrits authentiques,* p. 153 sq.). He borrowed the essentials from St. Thomas' Commentary on the *Sentences,* and developed them in the style of the Summa.

3 Cf. M. Grabmann, *Introduction,* p. 135-163.

teaching capable of being adapted to the most varied conditions [1], and also by preachers, who, treading in the wake of the great Christian orators, have drawn their inspiration from this work[2]. In addition, the use of the Summa extends to " the great questions and the great problems that interest *modern life and thought,* especially from a philosophical angle "[3], problems concerning knowledge, and moral, sociological and even political problems: in every sphere, St. Thomas' IΓ-Iiæ " is able to provide sound reconstructional elements, since it is the most profound scientific explanation of the Christian moral order[4]". But whatever may be the value of the Summa from all these joints of view, it is evident that its main purpose will always je that of giving a theological explanation : it remains the *ideal manual* for the teaching of speculative theology.

In teaching from the Summa a twofold method may be employed. First a systematic study, " by which the meaning, the underlying idea of each article is sought and examined from every angle with the purpose of obtaining a thorough grasp of the teaching contained in the work as a whole "[5]. This method entails, first an *analytical* study of the text, not only as regards the letter, but in relation to the Summa as a whole: the logical connection of the articles, questions, treatises, and parts, must be deeply impressed on the mind of those who would study St. Thomas. In the second place, it is necessary to compare the teaching of this work with the *other writings* of the Blessed Doctor, according to Massouillé's expression : *Divus Thomas, sui interpres***;* not forgetting the progress that took place in the author's own ideas: and this imposes a knowledge of the chronological order of the works. Lastly, the modern interpreter will profit by a study of the early *commentators,* the greatest of whom constitute unfailing guides for a sound understanding of the letter and the spirit of the work[7].

The second method of interpretation, known as the historical method, implies the foregoing and adds greatly to its value[8]. It endeavours to establish "the *fieri* of the

1 See the *Bibliogr.,* io.

2 Grabmann quotes Bossuet, Monsabré and Fr. Tanvier. *Ol>. cit* n ica

¡ *Ibid.,* p. 155-156. — 4 */bid.,* p. 160. Z' ·» I. M

5 *Ibid.,* p. 136. Cf. p. 136-139.

6 *Op. cit.* Cf. *Bibliog.* 7.

7 Cf. *Biblio°.,* 4. — ¿ See GrabNíANN, *op. cit.,* p. 139-151.

texts and ideas " rather than " the *esse* of the Thomist doctrine"[1]. With this method, "the works of St. Thomas are considered and appreciated with respect to the vital bond that links them to Scholasticism as a whole, until they stand out sharply against the background of the Christian culture of the Middle Ages "[2]. This method compares the writings of the Angelic Doctor, " and particularly the *Summa theologica,* with their sources, their models and their forerunners: it unravels the threads that bind them to contemporary works; and lastly it seeks to discover the influence wielded by St. Thomas on the age that came immediately after him "[3]. The patient works of research that have been occasioned by this method, not only reveal the outstanding place occupied by St. Thomas' works in the history of theology, but often throw light on obscure and vexed questions[4].

Thanks to the *Summa theologica* a similar work of comparison may be made in the course of teachings, as regards the essential points whose Thomist character is almost universally admitted, at least in the school that claims St Thomas alone as its master. Only these points will be insisted upon in the following doctrinal synthesis. They will be enough to show what an advance is marked by the Thomist systematisation over the best of earlier works, even those of St. Augustine[6]; they will also show with sufficient clarity how the Angelic Doctor differs from the other great Doctors, especially those who have given their name to schools of thought: St. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, Suarez, in theology ; St. Teresa and St. Francis of Sales, for instance, in spirituality.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 140. — [2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

[4] The influence of St. Thomas' works in non-Catholic circles, especially in the East, also provides an interesting and useful subject of research. The two Summae were translated into Greek in the xivth century by a Catholic, D. Cydonès. See below, p. 690. But even the dissidents read them and made use of them, such for instance as *George Schola/ios* (d. after 1472), patriarch under the name of Gennadius [11] (the first to be named by the Turks after 1453): a theologian and philosopher, he composed a *Summary* of the *Sum. contra Gent.,* and the *Summa theol.* (Ia and P-næ) ; This summary fills vol. tv and V of the edition of the *Complete JCorhs,* edited by Mgr Petit and M. Jugie, A. A. : see vol. 1, *Introd.,* p. ix.

[5] i. e., with no purpose of research, such as the solution of a problem or the clarification of an obscure point of doctrine.

[4] See vol. I, p. 672-716.

ARTICLE IV,

DOCTRINAL SYNTHESIS OF THOMISM.

I. THOMISM.

By Thomism we mean the doctrine and doctrinal method of St. Thomas. Without any qualification, the word "Thomism" should mainly signify a *theology.* No doubt St. Thomas was a philosopher of genius: by means of his philosophy he renewed and completed the theology of the early writers: further, it was he who, of all the doctors of the Middle Ages, did the most to obtain for philosophy that relative independence that is its due. Nevertheless theology came first for St. Thomas, as is seen by the vastness and the quality of his work and by the importance he himself attributed to it[1]. St. Thomas insists that philosophy remains subject to theology and plays the part of a valuable auxiliary[2]. The thinker helps the believers but does not supersede him. He was primarily a theologian, *the prince of theologians.* Thomism in its fullest sense means a theology (synthesis or method). Nevertheless a narrower[4] but still exacts connotation may be given to the term *philosophical Thomism,* particularly in view of the fact that the unequalled co-ordination of rational principles achieved by St. Thomas in giving new life to Aristotle was wholly and entirely his own work.

A). Philosophical Thomism.

St. Thomas was not content to imitate Aristotle's philosophy: he was a veritable creator. He formed "the first

[1] By insisting on his historical role however it is possible to show that St. Thomas was more a philosopher than a theologian.

[2] Non enim accipit (theologia) sua principia ab aliis scientiis, sed immediate a Deo per revelationem. Et ideo non accipit ab aliis scientiis tanquam a superioribus, sed utitur eis *tanquam inferioribus et ancillis...* Et hoc ipsum quod sic utitur eis non est propter defectum et insufficientiam ejus, sed propter defectum intellectus nostri. *Sum. theol.,* Ia, q. i, a. 5, ad 2. Cf. *In Boe. De Trinity* q. II, a. 3, ad 7.

[3] Conversely the believer guides the thinker, and enables St. Thomas to correct many of Aristotle's weaker points.

[4] Philosophy does not emlxxly dogma—but vice versa.

[5] Not ambiguous, like philosophical Augustinism. See p. 357 and 473.

and only great scientific systematisation capable of implementing Christian teaching. He was the first to proclaim with conviction the independence of rational knowledge, delivering it, both in fact and principle, from its dependence on theological speculation and particularly theodicy, psychology and moral doctrines. Practising what he preached he carried out all his philosophical works without ever having recourse to any other authority than experience and reason in order to establish and defend his scientific conclusions. He clearly formulated a theory of progress in knowledge, defined and classified the sciences, established the spirit proper to each and treated in detail all the special philosophical sciences: Logic, Metaphysics, Theodicy, Cosmology, general Physics, Psychology, Ethics and Politics. Mischief philosophical works are in the form of commentaries on Aristotle; but all his works, both theological and scriptural are strongly imbued with philosophy. At every page is found clear and penetrating light on all the problems of the human mind. The philosophical labours of Thomas Aquinas showed how Aristotle could be assimilated, and endowed the Church with a deep and firmly rooted Christian philosophy " [1].

With regard to Aristotle, St. Thomas not only had to isolate his teaching from that of the Arabian philosophers who had corrupted it*, but also to correct various points of the primitive original doctrine, that was not free from certain *errors*[3]. Their gravity lay not so much in themselves as in the naturalism they cloaked, an unbridled rationalism offensive to Christian faith. Exemplarism, based on Plato's ideas, denied by Aristotle, seemed to be placed in doubt. But " though Plato's philosophy contains a number of theories more akin to Christianity, Aristotle's method of philosophising· is superior and more in line with the belief and thought of the Church"[4]. From a wider viewpoint,

[1] Mandonnet, *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Did. théol.*, col. 881.

[2] See above, p. 477.

[3] Aegidius Romanus *(De erroribus philosophorum,* c. I-ll) counts no less than thirteen errors in Aristotle: 1. quod motus non incepit; 2. quod tempus est æternum; 3. quod mundus non incepit; 4. quod caelum non est factum; 5. quod Deus non posset alium mundum facere; 6. quod generatio et corruptio non inceperunt nec desinunt; 7. quod sol semper causavit generationem et corruptionem in istis inferioribus; 8. quod non est possibilis resurrectio mortuorum; 9. quod Deus non potest facere accidens sine subjecto; 10. quod in quolibet composito sit tantum una forma substantialis, quod dicitur esse falsum; 11. quod non sit dare primum hominem nec pluviam; 12. quod nullo modo duo corpora possint esse in eodem loco; 13. quod tot sunt orbes quod sunt angeli ; propter quod sequitur quod sint lx vel i.xv. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant,* Append. I, p. 5-8.

[4] A. Chollet, *Aristotelism,* in *Did. théol.*, col. 1878.

" Aristotle's superiority over other philosophers, derives, according to the Schoolmen, either from the fact that the Stagirite reasoned about all things..., or from the more rigorous and dialectic manner of his argumentation ; or from the fact that his method of argument, being experimental, was more trustworthy; or lastly because his logic proved a most marvellous instrument in advancing philosophical learning'. It is St. Thomas' glory to have placed such a wonderful force in the service of the Church and the faith. Aristotle's philosophy thus amended by a master thoroughly imbued with its spirit and careful to preserve it, is, in a manner of speaking, far better than the original, and rightly called Thomist philosophy[2].

St. Thomas distinguished the natural order from the order of grace more clearly than his predecessors, the Augustinian theologians. It is co-extensive with those truths that man can discover with his own powers. St. Thomas explains it entirely by means of rational principles, without invoking any supernatural intervention with the exception of the creation of the world, the general government of the universe and the creation of spiritual souls[3]. This is very evident in his solution of that all important problem which rules all philosophy, *the origin of ideas :* St. Thomas explains it by a natural activity of the intellect, without bringing in God, otherwise than for any other natural operation. Aristotelism was of great use to him here, by providing him with a group of principles, either unknown to his predecessors or insufficiently appreciated bv them.

His fully developed theory of a double intellect took the place of the complicated Augustinian theory of illumination. St. Thomas certainly maintained that " the natural or gratuitous light of our minds is no other than the imprint of the first truth"[4]: and by these words he reminds us that God is the creator of the mind, and that His ideas, the transcendant source of essences, are the final, not the immediate source of all true knowledge[5]. But these relations whether natural or supernatural, though admitted by St. Thomas, were not incorporated by him in his theory of knowledge as an essential element, as was the case for Augustine[6]. They really form a philosophical corollary[7] or a theological complement[8]. It is not surprising· therefore that he also

1 */bid.* — 3 See Fundamental Principles, below, p. 577.

3 On miracles, see the article quoted *(Bibtiog.,* 6) by A. Van Hove.

4 Ipsum lumen intellectus nostri, sive naturale sive gratuitum, nihil aliud est quam quædam impressio Veritatis primæ. *Sum. tìicol* I, q LXXXVIII, art. 3, ad 1.

5 See *Ibid.,* I, q. LXXXIV, a. 5.

6 Sec above, *introduction* to book iv, p. 358. Cf. n. 47.

7 In the case of natural relations.

8 In the case of theological relations.

eliminated [*] from his definitive system all the more or less felicitous rhilosophical constructions' that the first thinkers of the Middle Ages lad added to a predominantly theological Augustinian teaching. The Angel of the Schools was more practical than his predecessors and confided to reason alone the task of solving the problems of nature.

In Thomism, therefore, philosophy is independent inasmuch as it is recognised as being self-sufficient in its own sphere. Previously, it had been mainly regarded as the servant of theology', since, in fact, the main reason for its study lay in the services it could render the faith. This, however, had not prevented authors from writing philosophical treatises on purely rational subjects. Thanks to Aristotle and St. Thomas such writings were destined to multiply [2] It is nevertheless evident that nothing would have been more repugnant to St. Thomas than any' exaggeration of the independence he gives to reason. The latter can never, without error, *contradict* the faith, for truth cannot be opposed to truth; moreover, reason in the course of its speculation should never lose sight of the facts known by faith. Above all, it can never claim to take the place of faith, or supersede theology. Some " modern " thinkers have seen in Thomism a milestone on the road to a complete intellectual emancipation where " Reason falls heir to Theology ", But here is no advance but rather decadence, whereby reason instead of reaching a full maturity with full confidence in its powers, is diminished by' its inability to recognise its own limitations and the spheres of knowledge that lie beyond its ken. Such fettered pride was neither desired nor prepared by' Saint Thomas. While giving a large measure of independence to reason, he adapted it magnificently to his theological work [4].

B). Thomist Theology.

Philosophy may be termed wisdom inasmuch as it takes cognisance of the universe through the most noble causes

[*] Although in the *In II Sent.*, Dist. 17, q. 2, a. 1, he still maintains as probable the illuminist theory (God as the active intellect in man). MANDONNET, *Siger de Brabant,* p. cci.ix. See however, below, p. 578. n. 1.

[2] See p. 473.

[3] M. Gilson especially insists on this effect of Thomism, in *Le thomisme.* (See above, p. 528).

[4] Both in the opinion of St. Thomas and in reality, this implies no degradation of reason but a recognition of its grandeur, since it is thus judged capable of playing an important part in a domain that transcends its own. And here of course it may be strengthened by eminent supernatural gifts. See below, p. 576.

of the natural order. This wisdom reaches its highest point in metaphysics and especially in natural theology. From the latter must be distinguished *sacred learning'* or theology in the proper sense of the word, which treats of the same supreme object in the light of revealed principles[2], and which is also a *wisdom,* the greatest of all λ

Theology nevertheless is a true science·», speculative.rather than practical, since it is concerned primarily with God and secondly with human acts[5]. Its object makes of it an *all-embracing* learning. Its primary object however is God; it is concerned with the'study of created beings only inasmuch as they relate to God[6]. In many ways it may be said to be the greatest of sciences; it is directly based on faith whose formal object is the authority of God revealing, which provides a certainty that of itself surpasses even the greatest of human certainties[7]; on the other hand it deals with the most profound realities both in the speculative and the practical order[8]. And it is precisely the greatness of its object that confers a special dignity on theology: not only is it a science, but also a *wisdom,* since it studies the highest cause in the light of the highest principles.

There is no question here, in the true sense of the term, of the gift of wisdom, which knows divine things "per modum inclinationis"[9];* but of the virtue of wisdom, inspiring faultless judgment " per rationis inquisitionem" or " per modum cognitionis " ,0. The gift of course may have its part", but it does not essentially constitute theology as the science of revealed things.

As may be seen, reason plays a large part in theology. It is not of course responsible for its principles, the revealed data : it receives them from above : and we may therefore call it " a certain imprint of the very knowledge of God"[12]. Nevertheless theology does not transcend reason to the extent of rendering impossible or useless its application to such a subject. St. Thomas assigns to it a threefold activity: it should demonstrate the prolegomena of faith; show its congruence by means of demonstrative proofs; lastly, resolve the objections of adversaries by showing their falsehood or weakness, while preserving the integrity of the mystery [13]. Nothing is better calculated to aid the reason in this threefold task than a systematic grouping of revealed

[1] *Sum. theoi.,* 1, q. I, art. i-io. See definition of theology according to St. Augustine, vol. I, p. 669 sq. — [2] *Ibid.,* a. 1, ad 1. — [3] *Ibid.,* a. 6.
[4] *Ibid.,* a. 2. — [5] *Ibid.,* a. 4. — [6] *Ibid.,* a. 3. ad 1. — [7] *Ibid.,* a. 5. — [8] *Ibid.,* a. 5.
[9] *Ibid.,* a. 6, ad 3. Ex instinctu divino *(Sum. theoi.,* i-næ, q. 68, a. I, ad 4). Secundum quamdam connaturalitatem *(Ibid.,* Il-næ, q. 45, a. 2).
[10] *Ibid.,* a. 6 ad 3 and *Ibid.,* il-ll®, q. 45, a. 2. — [11] See below, p. 376.
[12] *Ibid.,* I, q. I, a. 3, ad 2.
[13] *In Boet., De Trinil.,* q. 11, a. 3.

data and the conclusions that derive therefrom. In consequence the chief work of reason in its endeavour to understand faith, " fidens quærens intellectum " *, in the measure that is possible in this life, is *theological construction.* St. Thomas is the acknowledged master in such systematisation.

It should be remarked moreover, that in the method of the greatest of speculative theologians authority is given a large place beside reason. The very nature of theology imposed this as an obligation, as also did his extremely positive turn of mind as witnessed by his philosophical work, three cpiarters of which consists of detailed analyses of texts[2]. His not inconsiderable exegetical writings are a constant reproduction of the best patristic explanations. The Commentary of the Sentences is a veritable commentary by the Fathers, and he similarly explained the treatises of Boethius and Dionysius. In the Summa as well as in his other writings, says Fr. Gardeil[3], "an incessant use is made of citations". According to the method usual since the time of Abelard they are found both in the form of objections and that of solutions to difficulties. St. Thomas' reading was very wide and in advance of most of his contemporaries, both as regards its extent and its critical penetration [4].*

Rational speculation implements and completes the argument from authority. The simplicity and elevation of the principles to which the Angelic Doctor constantly appeals is particularly striking. They give to this vast encyclopedia of religious knowledge that is the Summa theologica, a very marked *synthetic* character, an essential factor in its powerful unity. But on the other hand each point is treated according to an unfailing analytical method that insures against obscurity. It has been said that St. Thomas "observes and analyses the whole life of the soul with astonishing mastery: conscience, as well as the internal faculties and operations, whether he deals with passions and emotions, or the intelligence and the will "[5]. The same procedure is to be admired in his political and moral treatises; but it is evidently even more successful in speculative sciences in which deduction predominates[6]. He was able to determine the limits of reason by insisting on the impossibility of giving a true demonstration of faith ",

[1] See above, p. 406.
[2] Gardeil, *La documentalion de S. Th.,* in *Revue thomiste,* 1903.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 205.
[4] Fr. Mandonnet, *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 876-878.
[5] *Ibid.,* col. 878. — [6] *Ibid.* See above, 556.
[7] *In Boet., De Trinit.,* q. li, a. 3. *Sum. theoi.,* I, q. 1, a. 8.

and of attaining to any adequate understanding of the mystery[1]. The Augustinians, though well aware of these limitations, did not stress them; rather did their mysticism lead them to underline that deep understanding that a developed faith bestows on the Christian.

St. Thomas' method has no direct recourse to mystical illumination. The Angelic Doctor was neither ignorant nor contemptuous of such illumination, for he was aware that there exists a form of intellectual activity connected with the contemplative life in which the discursive process takes place "secundum illuminationes divinas"[2], in which the mind "employs divine illuminations in its reasoning"[3]. And if any rational speculation is adapted to such divine aids, it is obviously that of the theologian. Nevertheless, this illumination, no matter how valuable it may be, remains too dependent of subjective conditions—for God as a rule intervenes by means of His gifts only in those souls that have been transfigured by a long purification—for us to regard it as an integral and necessary factor in a general scientific method, one of whose main characteristics is to be objective and universal[4]. In consequence St. Thomas is content to remark without undue insistence, that theology like preaching is an "opus quod ex plenitudine contemplationis derivatur"[5], thus connecting theology chiefly with the supernatural virtue of wisdom, without, however, excluding the gift[6].

The Augustinians as a rule, at least in theory, gave greater importance to the gift and to contemplation. Among the causes of the disagreement that put Franciscans and Dominicans in opposite camps towards the end of the Xliith century, these diverse tendencies, mentioned by St. Bonaventure himself, must not be overlooked[7]. They were no more than tendencies and should not be exaggerated.

1 *Sum. théol.,* I, q. 32, a. I. *In Boet., De Trinit.,* q. 1, a. 4.

2 *Sum. theol.,* IIMI®, q. iSo, a. 6, ad 3.

3 Illuminationibus divinis ratiocinando utitur. *Ibid.,* ad 2.

4 The other subjective conditions form part of a moral and supernatural preparation distinct from theology in the true sense.

5 *Sum. theol.,* II'-U®, q. 1S8, a. 6.

6 As was seen above. St Thomas prepared himself for study by prayer and fasting, and he was filled with supernatural light. See above, p. 540.

7 "The former (Preaching Friars) were mainly concerned with speculation, as becomes the name they bear, and only secondarily with unction; the latter (Friars Minor) tended principally to suavity of style and afterwards to speculation". *In Hexalm.,* Coll. XXII. *{Op. om.,* v, 44'0).

Both were justifiable. The Thomist method', frankly speculative and intellectual, has given to the Church the most powerful theological synthesis ever written, and such a work is enough to prove its value.

II. PHILOSOPHICAL PRINCIPLES.

In keeping with St. Thomas' own method in the Summa we will combine in this outline the natural truths concerning God, the soul, the world and morality, with the theological explanation of these matters. At this juncture we will do no more than recall the great metaphysical principles to which the author appeals in every treatise for the solution of all manner of problems in the natural and supernatural orders, in theology as well as in pure philosophy. They form, as it were, the soul of Thomism, giving wonderful cohesion to the whole. St. Thomas' ideas must always be understood "in relation to his general synthesis and particularly his metaphysics which regulates the plan of his whole work. Eclecticism has no place in Thomist teachings, since all their value and force lies essentially in the power of their unity "[1].

A). Intellectual knowledge.

Rejecting the philosophical interpretations of St. Augustine's *divine illumination* that were elaborated by the first schoolmen of the Middle Ages, St. Thomas very carefully worked out a theory of intellectual knowledge which rules his entire philosophy.

The object that is proper to intellectual activity in general is being. Further, this activity and immateriality are co-relative. The human soul, endowed with intelligence, is able to come into contact with being, but owing to its union with the body, can do so only through the intermediary of sensible objects. It follows that in our present state

1 "Thomas engaged his school and his Order in a powerful philosophical and theological intellectualism, whilst Bonaventure aimed at establishing a school of mystical theology' maintaining as far as possible previous Augustinian theology". P. MANDONNET, *Si^er de Brabant,* Introd., p. cxm.

' P. MANDONNET, *Frères Prêcheurs* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 883. The fundamental philosophical teaching of St. Thomas has of late years been brought together in 24 theses that have been especially approved by the Holy See as suitable for teaching. *Principia el pronuntiata majora* in the *Motti Proprio* of Pius X, June 29th, 1914; *Acta Apost. Sedis,* vi, p. 383 sq. Italian commentary by Fr. Ma t t iUSSI, S. J., Rome, 1917 (Fr. Mattiussi was the first to draw up these theses). French commentary by E. UuGON, *Les vin^t-quatre thèses thomistes,* Paris, 1922 (2nd ed.). Some authors consider this philosophical codex as too inflexible and prefer to adopt a wider "Thomism", such as that of Suarez. See below, p. 779.

the proportional and adequate object of the mind is being, abstracted from sensible objects.

The human intellect thus contains an active principle, termed the *active* intellect, which abstracts the intelligible "species" from the internal image *(phantasm')* and opens the way to knowledge[1]2 But al bottom, inasmuch as it produces the very act of knowing, the intellect is said to be *passive* (or *potential,* inasmuch as it is able to receive, reproduce and express all things). The mind is given form by the intelligible "species" that it receives *(impressa)* and in combination with it, elaborates a representation of the object, a new "intelligible species" that perfectly expresses the object and is called the *expressed* species *(species expressa)* or better still the *word·*.

The mind is able to know all things, but not in the same manner. Its primary and proper object is the abstracted *universal*[3]*;* this is first apprehended in a confused manner by the mind and then more distinctly by means of its own activity and in proportion to that activity. The concrete and *individual* being which forms the object of the senses is known by the mind only by means of recourse to the images which formed their first medium[4]. *Spiritual* beings may also be apprehended by man, but only by analogy. The soul has no perfect intuition of itself; it sees itself only in, and through its acts, on which it reflects, thus attaining gradually to an ever clearer understanding of its operations, its faculties and its nature. The nature of pure spirits can be known only- by analogy and *a fortiori* that of God Himself.

The universal object of the mind, though abstract, is real, or rather precisely because it is abstract, and in the measure that it is so, because the mind, by its reflection, attributes to it qualities that are mainly its own production and which, moreover, are of extreme importance since they give to the universal its proper formality. Hence the Thomist solution of the famous question of the universals: the universal as such is a product of the mind, but has its basis in extra-mental reality[5].

The *idea* or intellectual representation of the object is said to be true because of its conformity with the latter: it is logical truth, which is defined, *adeequatio intellectus ad rem*[6]. This is better and more exactly applied to *judgment,* by means of which the mind perceives

1 It may be wondered whether St. Thomas in his Commentary of the Sentences (Dist. 17, q. 2, a. I, in c.) together with various Augustinians, principally Bacon, did not admit that God fulfils the function of the active intellect in man as regards primary ideas. This has been claimed. Heitz, *op. cit.,* p. 146. The context however suggests another interpretation. See M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 19-20.

2 By *species,* St. Thomas usually means the *species impressa,* the other usually being signified by the word *verbunt.*

3 For Scotus, on the contrary, the primary object of the human mind is being *qua* l>emg.

4 Scotus on the other hand admits the intuition of the individual by the mind.

5 Habent fundamentum in re extra animam, sed complementum rationis eorum, quantum ad id quod est formale, esi per operationem animæ, ut patet in universali. *In I Sent.,* Dist. χιχ, q. 5, a. 1, sol. This moderate realism was current in the schools from the end of the Xiith century.

6 I he formula *adaquatio rei et intellectus* is general. The definition oí ontological truth is *adaquatto tet ad intellectum. In I Sent., ibid.*

its operation. Nevertheless, these indisputable theses are a corollary of that which establishes the existence of God and His nature rather than the basis of its demonstration. To the mind of St. Thomas they formed the apex of the doctrine of knowledge rather than its base 4.

B). Primary ideas.

The idea of being, since it is the first and noblest of the ideas perceived by the mind 5, forms the culminating point of metaphysics. Yet it is hardly possible to separate from being *(ens, res)* the TRANSCENDENTAL properties6 that necessarily accompany it: oneness *(unum, aliquid),* truth *(adœquatio rei ad intellectum [divinum velhumanum])!* and good f*convenientia entis cum appetitu [divino vel humano])* 8. These ideas that are equally universal with the idea of being and are derived immediately from it, share its ontological value. The same is to be said of primary principles, that is to say, the JUDGMENTS that are directly suggested by the simple perception of being: the principle of *identity* (being is what it is), the principle of *contradiction* or rather of non-contradiction (being is not non-being, *or* nothing can be and not be at the same time), the principle of *sufficient reason* (everything that is has its reason for being, *or* every being has a sufficient reason); hence this further formula:

' See below, p. 580. — a See above, p. 572.

l *De verit.,* q. I, a. 2; q. 21, a. 4.

4 Card. Mercier, *Mélaphysiq. générale,* Louvain, 1905 (4th ed.), p. 220-222, 256-258.

5 *De verit.,* q. i, a. i: "Illud autem quod primo intellectus concipit quasi notissimum, et in quo omnes conceptiones resolvit, est ens

6 *Quodl.* Vili, a. 4. See Garrïgou-Lagrange, *Dieu,* p. 152-153, 203.

"*Stun. theol.,* I, q. 14, a. 1, 2, 3. — 8 *Ibid.,* q. 5, a. 1, 2.

" everything is intelligible " which corresponds to the same principle. To this principle of internal reason applicable to all being, are connected, in relation to contingent beings for which existence is not essential, two principles of extrinsic sufficiency, that of *causality* (efficient) which explains existence (nothing gives existence to itself) and that of *finality* which explains order in multiplicity (every agent acts for an end).

All the primary ideas from which these evident propositions derive, possess a veritable ontological value r. First, they are not merely mental constructions : they are in the mind but, as has been said, they come from outside. Nor, on the other hand, are they pure representations of. exterior and sensible phenomena. Beyond phenomena they attain to being itself. *Being',* of course, is only perceived by us in the sensible, but that is accidental to it. Of itself, being is not sensible but intelligible and a source of intelligibility[1]. To this ultra-phenomenal reality, rightly termed ontological, man penetrates by his intelligence. What is said of being is applicable to its *connected attributes.* " It is clear that unity, truth, and good are immediately linked up with being inasmuch as they are its properties. Unity is undivided being. Truth is being, conformed to the intelligence on which it depends, or the conformity of the intelligence to the being that is its measure. Good is being inasmuch as appetible. These ideas do not therefore correspond to sensible phenomena, but to something deeper and intelligible in itself, and like being, they do not imply matter in their formal meaning "[3]. They are perceived together with being by means of a real " abstractive intuition "[4] of the intelligence. The primary *principles,* as was seen above, must also be reduced to this perception of being; they are no more than its immediate application, and are found in the same ontological order.

[1] See the lucid and profound development by Garrigou-Lagrange, *Dieu,* p. 108-191.

[3] " It (being) can never be expressed in a sensible image, even a composite image, that bears a name, whatever nominalist empiricists may say. An image can never represent anything but phenomena in juxtaposition, never their deepseated *raison d'être.* This latter indeed is nothing extended, coloured, hot or cold: it implies no matter; it is the luminous centre of every idea and makes intelligible the various sensible elements *Jbid.,* p. 124.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 125-126.

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 107, 132.

It may be demanded whether primary ideas possess in addition to their ontological value, a real transcendent value, whetherthat is to say, they allow us to attain to a Being that transcends the world as we know it. Undoubtedly. For on the one hand these ideas express *absolute* perfections, perfections whose "formal nature contains no imperfection" [1]; on the other hand, these perfections are *analogical,* i. e., "capable of existing according to essentially diverse manners", unlike those that are classified in a *genus* and are necessarily *univocal:* the *genus* points to something absolutely identical throughout all the species and individuals that compose it. The affirmation that being and its attributes are perfections transcending *genus,* entails the assertion that they are analogical [3] and that in consequence they may be common to all beings, even God, not in an absolutely identical sense, but according to a certain similitude, analogy or measure. It follows that inasmuch as they are absolute perfections, the supreme metaphysical realities truly allow us to know something of God. Nevertheless, they do not reveal to us the positive nature of His perfections because of their analogical character; we perceive but an image of them, a simple *analogy of proportionality* [4].

C) First determinations or divisions of Being.

I. The most universal divisions of being are those of actuality and potentiality which form its primary and intrinsic elements. This division is so strict that all

1 *Ibid.,* p. 191-223.

3 *Ibid.,* p. 199. The author associates with primary ideas, as regards the absolute character of their perfection, not only causality and finality, but also intelligence and will. *Ibid.,* p. 203-206.

3 Duns Scotus considers being as univocal. See below, p. 650. St. Thomas admits neither the univocacy of the word as applied to God and creatures, nor its equivocalness, but rather analogy. *Sum. lheol.,* 1, q. 13, art. 5 sq.

4 The following should be distinguished : lhe analogy of *attribution* made by a mere extrinsic designation in one of the terms: health as attributed to air or to an animal ; lhe analogy of *proportion* which supposes a *true relation* founded on a property common to lhe iwo terms: existence attributed to the substance and to the accidents; the analogy of *proportionality* consisting in the *resemblaiui-o/ two relations:* it implies that an analogous property is found in its proper and intrinsic signification in both terms: being is thus formally and intrinsically predicated of God and the creature, but according to a simple resemblance; as for instance the following relations: God is to His existence what the creature is to his existence. *70e Veritate,* q. 11, art. 11. Cf. Garrigou-Lagrange, 0/. *at.,* p. 530-548.

that is not *pure actuality* or *pure potentiality* must be composed of actuality and potentiality. Actuality as such is a perfection; it is limited only by potentiality or the capacity for perfection, so that pure actuality must be unique, and the multiple and the finite necessarily imply composition of actuality and potentiality. They are found in every genus save that of the Infinite and Perfect Being[1].

2. The distinction of essence and existence in being renders complete and exact the distinction of actuality and potentiality. Essence is the quiddity of being *(what being is);* existence is that *by which it is* and that which determines it in its ultimate perfection. Essence is a perfection, an actuality; but it is potentiality with regard to existence, unless the latter is the essence of the being, as is the case of the pure Actuality, the *necessary* Being. With this one exception, all being is *contingent*[3] existence not being essential to it. Evidently for contingent beings there is a real distinction between the ideal (possible) essence, and the actual concrete essence. But further, *in the being actually existing* there must be established between essence and existence, not only a distinction of reason, conceded by all, but also a real distinction, since the reality of the essence cannot be confused with what actuates it[2].

3. The distinction between substance and accidents is the highest division of beings by determinate categories: substance in the logical order constitutes a genus, the highest genus. Substance of itself is accessible only to the intelligences which apprehends it "as soon as the first of the internal senses has brought together the data of the external senses"<—"To the perception of this intelligence, substance is but a first determination of being, necessary to render intelligible with regard to being a phenomenal group that appears as autonomous... The intelligence apprehends *being* confusedly, " something that is". "This first object known by the intelligence becomes in an exact manner *a single and permanent subject* (substance) after the intelligence has

[1] Our knowledge of the perfect and the infinite is consequent on our knowledge of the finite and imperfect.

[3] All Thomists with rare exceptions have always considered this thesis as one of the most important of Thomism. It is denied by other schools, which mainly insist on contingency.

[3] *Sum. íheol.,* IIIa, a. 76, a. 7.

[4] *Comm. anima.* bk. II, v. 13.

observed the multiplicity and mutability of its phenomena" 1. Substance is being in the fullest sense of the word, that which exists in itself or subsists, and in relation to which the phenomenon exists, *ens entis* or accident2.

Complete, individual and independent *{sui juris)* substance, termed a person if endowed with reason, is called a *subsisting* being3. St. Thomas does not treat *ex professo* the principle of this ultimate perfection of being, i. e., *subsistence* (abstract). Many theologians of his School make a real distinction between it and the essence 4 and associate it more or less closely with existence5.

With an eye to theology, St. Thomas treats of accidents at length, especially in the metaphysical order. His teaching on this point may be brought under three heads6. " First of all the accident is an objective form or entity, differentiated from the substance and entering into a real composition with it. This undoubted distinction is mainly perceived in the faculties, habits and acts7... In the second place it is possible for the accident to be separated miraculously from the substance and should it possess of itself a certain individuality, to remain without any support save that of divine power, since any effect depends much more on the first cause than on its immediate cause8... In the third place it should be remembered that the accident is in no wise produced by way of creation but emanates necessarily from its subject as a property, whether it be drawn from the potentiality of the subject, either from its *natural potentiality* by the action of a created agent or from its *obediential potentiality* by the action of the Infinite "9. Innumerable applications of these principles are made in the theology ol the sacraments, grace and the supernatural operations in the soulI0.

4. The distinction of matter and form is less general than that of substance and accident : it is applied only

1 R. Garrigou-L,\grange, *op. cit.,* p. 167-168.

2 *Sum. thcol.,* I, q. 85, a. 5.

3 Or *subsistence* as employed by St. Thomas, *Sum. thcol., I,* q. 29, a. 2.

4 Unlike Duns Scotus who admits merely a distinction of reason. See below, p. 657.

5 According to Capreolus and a number of modern authors subsistence is the existence *in se* of the complete substance. See p. 624. Cajetanus however considers it as a distinct substantial modality. See p. 742. The conceptions oí Scotus and Suarez are entirely different; see p. 657 and p. 782.

' Hug ON, *Les 2./ thèses,* p. 41-43.

• *Quast. disp., De spirit, creat., λ.* XI, ad I. — 8 *Sum. theol.,* I, q. 77, a. I and 2.

9 E. Hugon, *op. cit.,* p. 41-42. — 10 See *ibid.,* p. 45'56.

to sensible being's [*]. Corporeal being, like all contingent being, is composed of actuality and potentiality, but in the former, *potentiality* is termed matter while *actuality* is called form, material form. These are substantial co-relative elements. The *form* is the principle of the activity, energy and unity of all the perfections that are found in the body.

These perfections, however, are extremely relative precisely because of the *matter* with which the form is essentially connected and which is the principle of passivity, inertia, multiplicity and division[1]. Nevertheless, despite its composition the material substance is *in se* indivisible into *integral parts*[3]. The latter derive from *quantity* which is no more than an accident, though the first and most important of all, since, miraculously, it is able to take the place of substance as the support of the qualities and other accidents[4].* To the substance it gives extension by means of the distinction of parts to which it gives position outside one another, and thus rends them separable. Quantity has other effects: it divides matter and is thus the principle of *individuation* of non-spiritual substances -\ Further it circumscribes the body in a *place,* so that it would be contradictory[6] to speak of its presence in one or several other places according to the same manner of quantitative circumscription[7]. Compénétration on the contrary is miraculously possible, though it is derogation of the natural impenetrability of bodies [8].

Forms (substantial) are material or intellectual. Material forms are " educed " from the potentiality of matter by the operation of the natural efficient cause, but the rational soul which has " a subsisting being " must be created by God[9]. There is, however, but a single substantial form, even in man, composed of body and soul,[0]. Every form that is added to a completely constituted being is accidental:" it may be called quality, a very generical term, which signifies forms both of an entitative order (disposition, shape, condition...) and of an operative order *{habitus,* virtue, faculties). In every being the first principle of action is the substantial form, but the accidents are associated with it: they also, together with the substance are directly responsible for the effect, and by virtue of the substance whose

1 St. Bonaventure thinks the contrary. See above, p. 511.

3 These words, *matter* and *form,* possess a special meaning in the theology of the sacraments.

3 Sum. theol., 1, q. 50, a. 2. *Contra Gentes,* tv, 65. — 4 In the Eucharist.

5 *Sum. theol.,* 1, q. 50. a. 4. *Cont. Gent.,* 11, c. 92-93. *De Ente et Ess.,* c. 2.

6 Scotus, Suarez and their schools do not admit there would be any contradiction.

7 Quodl., tit, a. 2. The circumscribed presence of a being in a place is not incompatible with the presence *(per modum substantia)* of the same being with other beings outside its own place *(extra locum suum,* says St. Thomas) and even in other places, but this indirectly, by the intermediary of a quantity.

s Quodl., I, a. 22. *Quodl.,* X, a. 3. M fl

9 Sum. theol., Ia, q. 90, a. 2 ad 2.

Ihid., q. 76, a. 4. Ihi> is one of the radical theses set out bv St. Thomas against the Augustinians. — " *Sum. th.,* in* q. 2, a. 6, ad 2.

instruments they are[1]. The operation is conformable to the substance that produces it: *operari sequitur esse*[2]. It belongs to the subject that produces it, as to its true first principle *(principium quod),* while it is of the same nature as the principle by which it is produced *{principium quo):* both are essential. The proximate principles of operation, on the contrary, even the active principles that are the faculties, are simple accidents (properties)[3]. As for the supernatural operations that man may be called upon to produce and the entitative and operative habits that form their proportionate principle, they may be based, in human nature, on a true *obediential potentiality,* a capacity for reception, to which the characters of the divine giftadapt themselves in a certain manner and which is consummated in "a vital collaboration with the supernatural operations"[4]5 All the life of grace finds a solid rational basis in these principles.

Among the properties of sensible being, one of the most important is movement, and this provides St. Thomas with a starting point in his first proof of the existence of God. In a strict sense movement is *physical* and may be classed as immanent or vital, qualitative or quantitative and especially local. Under all these forms it is explained by the principle : *quidquid movetur ab alio movetur.* Further, this principle is applied to movement taken in a wider and *metaphysical* sense as *change* (substantial or accidental) and even as spiritual and intellectual activity. This is no more than a simple adaptation of the principles of causation and sufficient reason which ultimately derive from the universal idea of beings. Theology makes a wide and extremely interesting use of all these metaphysical data.

III. GOD. THE TRINITY.

A). God. Existence and nature.

I. St. Thomas does not admit St. Anselm's argument *a priori.* The latter supposes that the existence of God is a self-evident truth, or at least capable of becoming so, without reference to contingent reality[6]. But the first thesis of the Angelic Doctor in his *Summa* states that the proposition " God exists ", while evident in itself, is not

1 *Ibid.,* Ia, q. 77, a. I, ad 3-4; q. 115, a. I ad 5.
2 Unumquodque sicut se habet ad esse, ita se habet ad agere, ma, q. 77, a. 3.
3Ibid., Ia, q. 77, a. I, etc.
4 A. Gardeil, *La puissance obédientielle au surnaturel selon S. Thomas* (p. 268-348) in *Structure de Pâme...,* vol. I.
5 R. Garrigou-lagrange, *Dieu,* p. 241-248.
6 See above, p. 404.

evident for us [1]. It is nevertheless capable of being demonstrated *a posteriori* by proceeding from the effects to the cause, by means of the principle of causality [2]. Such demonstration is strictly metaphysical "provided it proceeds from the right effect to the *right cause,* i. e., the cause on which the effect necessarily and immediately depends" [3].

St. Thomas distinguishes five ways by which the existence of God may be established. They differ mainly in the created concrete object which is used as the starting point of each demonstration: i. the *movement* of beings that surround us; either movement in its strict meaning or any kind of change; 2. their *efficient activity* manifested in the constant production of fresh beings; 3. their *contingency* which touches their deep reality, and is ephemeral as regards existence; 4. the relative *imperfection* of their essences, which is shown by the manifold degrees of being that can be distinguished; 5. lastly, the *order* of the universe; order in the whole and in the least detail, in the smallest creatures and in the greatest. All this supposes a *raison d'etre,* a cause; yet on the other hand in a series of causes it is not possible to proceed to infinity. Such are the two essential principles that form the kernel of the argument and lead to the conclusion: there is a First Cause; God exists [4].

What is most striking here is the concrete and objective character of the starting point. The metaphysical principle alone makes the demonstration possible, but St. Thomas seems to have exercised especial care in order to find for it a trustworthy and easily verifiable foundation. In this he differs sharply from the Augustinians who preferred to stress *psychological* realities, notably the most profound metaphysical truths considered at one and the same time as psychological facts and as principles of objective demonstration [5]. St. Thomas appears to have used a similar method with slight modifications in his fourth way. But his demonstration of God's existence, being less dependent on subjective data, is clearer and more sober. Il may be that the greater complexity of the Augustinian method rendered it in a sense more rich.

1 *Sum. theol.,* Ia, q. 2, a. I.

8 *Ibid.*, a. 3.

3 *Ibid.,* I, q. 104, a. I. See Garrigou-LagRANGE, *Diett,* p. 72-76 and 763-773·

4 *Sum. theol.,* I, q. 2, a. 3. See Garrigou-Lagrange, *Dieu,* p. 241-338.

5 See above, p. 407 (St. Anselm), p. 516 (St. Bonaventure), and vol. I, p. 672-674 (St. Augustine).

2. St. Thomas' teaching as to what formally constitutes the Divine Nature [1] is a matter of dispute even among Thomists[2]. Some make it consist in His subsisting intellectual thought[3], others His *aseity*, the *esse a se* [4]. But it would seem that St. Thomas really takes it to be *subsistent being* [5] and there is no doubt that he deduces all the other divine attributes from the Being of God. These attributes concern the nature and the operations of God, in Himself and *ad extra*.

a) "The attributes relating to the very Being of God are first the properties of being in general, raised to their supreme perfection: *simplicity* or oneness, *truth, goodness* or perfection. Then come *infinity* that excludes all limitation of essence, *immensity* and *ubiquity* excluding all limitations of space, and *eternity* excluding temporal limitations. Lastly, with regard to our natural knowledge, the Being of God is *invisible* and incomprehensible, yet nevertheless knowable by analogy.—The attributes *relating to the divine operations* may be divided accordingly as they concern the immanent divine operations or those that cause an effect exterior to God. The former are *Wisdom,* and *Providence* for the intelligence and *Love* for the will, and His two great virtues, *Mercy* and *fustice*. The immediate principle of the exterior divine works is *Omnipotence,* creating and preserving, on which depends the divine co-operation necessary to all created beings so that they may act and attain their end" [6]. The distinction of *positive* and *negative* divine attributes is less important than the foregoing since it is made "from a secondary point of view, more relative to our mode of knowledge" [7].

[1] R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Dicti,* p. 343*37°. "The divine perfections, such as they are *in themselves,* not distinct, arc equal, in the sense that none is more perfect than another and each implies the others. But inasmuch as they are distinct as regards our manner of knowing them, and analogically similar to created perfections, it is not impossible to discover an order among them, relative to the first". *Ibid.,* p. 349.

[2] Scotus differs from St. Thomas by taking God's Infinity as the fundamental attribute.

[3] John of St. Thomas, Billuart. St. Augustine should probably be classed with this group: he gives special importance to Truth, and to Wisdom.

[4] Capreolus, Banncz, Contenson.

[5] See R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *op. cit.,* p. 356-370.

[6] Garrigou-Lagrange, *op. cit.,* p. 371.

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 372.

It should be well understood how these perfections that we know through created things, have their being in God. They are not in Him only inasmuch as He is able to produce them *(causaliter, virlualiter)* [1] but according to their nature *(formaliter).* Nevertheless, they are in Him eminently, "that is to say, according to a modality, infinitely superior to created modality, which is known to us only negatively and relatively and which enables us to identify them with the formal essence of God without destroying them" [2]. This modality is to be explained by the analogical character of our knowledge which goes beyond equivocal predication but does not reach univocacy[3]. Though identical with the divine essence they are nevertheless *distinct* from one another "*virtually,* that is to say, according to a distinction of reason founded in reality, but subsequent to the consideration of the mind. The basis of this distinction is twofold: i. the eminence of the Deity by which He can identify in Himself perfections that are really distinct in creatures; and 2. the imperfection of our minds that cannot attain to God's absolute simplicity"[4]. This virtual distinction, however, could not be allowed, were it to be based on a *potentiality* in God: such would be the distinctions between essence and existence, intelligence and the act of knowing, will and the act of willing[5].

b) The operations of God relating to creatures form one of the most characteristic points of theological Thomism. God's *knowledge* is universal : it has for its primary object the divine essence inasmuch as this explicitly contains all His attributes and the relations of the Trinity. But it also extends to every other object, both the 'possibles' *(knowledge of simple intelligence)* and all beings actually called into existence in the past, present, and future *(knowledge of vision)*[6].* God perceives these latter, not in themselves[7], but in Himself in the decree that calls them into existence. Future contingents are also known to God in the decree that makes them present to Him for all eternity[8]. To say that God's knowledge of things derives from things themselves would be to ascribe imperfection to God: infinite intelligence

[1] Against Maimonides. *De potentia,* q. 7, a. 7; *Sum. th.,* I, q. 13, a. 2. Garrigou-Lagrange, *ibid.,* p. 516 sq.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 521.

[3] Duns Scotus though admitting the univocal nature of transcendental ideas applied to God, has to admit that the perfections expressed are in Him *really* and are distinguished*formally.* See p. 653.

[4] R. Garrigou-L., *ibid.,* p. 521. Cf. *In I Sent.,* D. 11, q. 1, a. 3.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 552-558. Cf. *Sum. theol.,* I, q. 3, a. 4 ; q. 14, a. 4 ; q. 54, a. 1-2.

[6] *Sum. theol.,* I, q. 14, a. 2, 9. *De Veril.,* q. 3, a. 3, ad 8. *C. Genies,* c. 60, 69.

[7] *Sum. theol.,* q. 14, a. S. GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE, *op. cit.,* p. 402.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 40S. The author remarks that the *medium* is the divine decree, presence being merely the *condition* of intuitive knowledge. Cf. *Sum. theol.,* I, q. 14, a. 13 (complement of art. 8).

would depend on the finite L Man's freewill, moreover, is not prejudiced by this universal intuition 14 even though it be based on a decree, for the *divine will* is essentialIv transcendent: its efficacy is sovereign, both as regards the effects that it produces and their mode of being; God uses proportionate causes for the production of necessary or contingent effects 3. *Divine causality* extends to every action of His creatures: God creates the power of acting, preserves it, applies it to its action (movet eam ad agendum; and finally, as first agent, moves it so as to produce in each thing according to its nature the most universal effect, the very being of the thing in question 4. This *divine movement* is more exactly explained in the *Summa* where mention is made of a threefold causality; final, efficient and formali. This movement in no wise excludes the action of a secondary cause, which, considered as an action of the First Cause, is thus subordinated to it6.* The divine motion is *total* cause of the effect, as is also the secondary cause in its own order 7.

These important principles are used as a basis for the solution of other associated questions, closely linked up with the divine knowledge and will. Such is *Providence,* which by an act of knowledge and will, regulates the order of the universe, as a whole and in its slightest detail8. Providence is an extension of Divine Wisdom. With both of these is associated *predestination,* a special providence touching the elect, whom God knows and for whom He prepares glory and the means of attaining it. And this without injustice to those who do not attain glory9. Later theology bitterly disputed the question of predestination to glory alone ,0. ^*Actual grace* granted to men for the accomplishment of supernatural actions was to be conceived as a divine

l According to Vasquez, on the contrary, it is more perfect for God to know created things immediately in themselves. According to Suarez, God knows them at one and the same time in Himself as in their cause and immediately in themselves. See L·. Mahieu, *Suarez,* p. 229-230.

' *C. Genies,* I, c. 68.

' Cum igitur voluntas divina sit efficacissima, non solum sequitur quod fiant ea quæ Deus vult fieri, sed et quod eo modo fiant quo Deus ea fieri vult. *Sum. th.,* I, q. 19, a. 8.

4 *De potentia,* q. 3, a. 7. Cf. *C. Gentes,* in, c. 67.

s *Sum. th.,* I, q. 105, a. 5.

6 *Ibid.,* ad 2. This *motion* of the First Cause implies a *priority,* not of time, but *oj nature,* over the action of the second cause: the word motion itself indicates this, and St. Thomas is content with that. His school has judged it opportune to stress this point by adopting the words *promotion* and *pre-deterruin-ation.* These terms have aroused lively opposition. See below, p. 755.

' Molina and his school generally look upon divine causality and human causality as two parallel and co-ordinated causalities. See below, p. 772.

8 *Sum. theol.,* I, q. 22, 4 articles.

9 ¡*bid.,* q. 23, 8 articles. — 10 See below, p. 758.

motion and its efficacy explained by the principles we have just indicated) '.

This magnificent Thomist systematisation is the supplement of the Augustinian theology, especially from a philosophical point of view and the *Augustinian trend* is faithfully followed. The doctrine is based on the highest principles drawn particularly from the nature of God, His independence and His universal action. Here the theologian comes face to face with mystery, but is not dismayed, for he is aware of the weakness of the human mind and its powerlessness before the transcendency of the First Cause[1]. The Molinist school, starting from other principles [3] arrived at somewhat divergent conclusions. It did not, however, succeed in avoiding the difficulties of the mystery, and perhaps aggravated them, despite appreciable advantages that were otherwise gained.

B). The Blessed Trinity.

In the course of a few questions St. Thomas splendidly summarises the speculations of early writers, especially St. Augustine*, who was his usual source of inspiration. Like the latter, he forcefully' asserts the impossibility of giving a true demonstration [5] of the mystery. He nevertheless surpasses all his forerunners by the appearance of logical rigour with which he treats this question. St. Augustine had proceeded by means of a gradual series of symbols, leading the soul by degrees to a perfect image. St. Thomas takes but a single image, a mind that knows and loves, but from this he draws all the rational elements of his argument. He sets it out in the first question of the treatise. He takes for granted that the existence of the three Persons has been established by Holy Writ and tradition[6]. His intention is to furnish a certain understanding of the mystery based on the analogy which he accepts as existing between the human soul and God, pure Spirit, Infinite and Perfect.

[1] See below, p. 755.

[2] A powerlessness that gradually diminishes as man forms a purer idea of God, free from unconscious anthropomorphism, to which our intellectual difficulties are due in a large measure. See vol. I, p. 694. — [3] See below, p. 771.

[4] See vol. I, p. 674. [5] *Sunt. fheol.,* I, q. 32, a. I.

[6] St. Augustine, on the contrary, establishes this point at length in the first 7 books of his *Di Trinitaie,* at the same time as he gives' a preliminary theological explanation of the doctrine.

The processions of the divine Persons (q. 27)[1] cannot be those of an effect with regard to a cause (Arianism) nor of a figment of reason (Modalism); they are real, spiritual and intellectual (art. 1). One of them may be termed generation, like an idea conceived by the mind (art. 2). There can be another by way of love (art. 3) but which cannot be called generation (art. 4); no others are possible (art. 5).—These processions at least imply *relations* (q. 28)[2] undoubtedly real (art. 1), not distinct from the essence as regards their fundamental being[3] (art. 2), but really distinct among themselves inasmuch as they are opposed relations[4] (art. 3). There can be no more than four relations in God: paternity, filiation, spiration and procession (art. 4).

These are the preliminary data on which is based the idea of person in God (q. 29)[5]. The person is thus defined by Boethius: *rationalis naturæ individua substantia* (art. 1): it is termed *hypostasis* or *subsistentia* inasmuch as it is a truly distinct substance[6][7] (art. 2). Since it is substance in all its perfection, it can be in God (art. 3); and since in God there are several persons, that which in some manner distinguishes them from the essence or nature cannot be other than relation. The latter is a person, not because it is a relation *(esse ad),* but because it is a distinct and subsistent being. A divine person may therefore be defined: *relatio ut subsistens* (art. 4), or, in a less contracted form: "Distinctum relatione subsistens in essentia divina"[7].

The idea of the person given in question 29 introduces a whole series of theological developments in various aspects of the mystery[8]. Among the questions which reveal more particularly the mark of the Angelic Doctor, may be mentioned those that treat more precisely of the five *notions* or marks peculiar to the persons, distinguishing them

[1] *Sum. th.,* q. 27, a. 1-5.

[2] *Ibid.,* q. 28, a. 1-4.

[3] "Patet ergo quod in Deo non est aliud esse relationis et essentiæ, sed unum et idem", In God relation is not an accident *(esse in).*

[4] Oportet quod in Deo sit realis distinctio... secundum rem relativam *(esse ad).*

[5] *Sum. th.,* I, q. 29, a. 1-4.

[6] Secundum quod per se existit et non in alio.—The expression found in art. 4, is more precise (Persona igitur in quacumque natura significat id quod est distinctum in natura illa) and elsewhere: *Distinctum subsistens* in natura (intellectuali) *De Potentia,* q. 9, a. 4. Cf. *In III Sent.,* D. 5, q. 1, a. 3.

[7] *De Potentia,* q. 9, a. 4. Subsistens distinctum in natura divina. *Ibid.* St. Augustine provided St. Thomas with the groundwork of this doctrine of relations as applied to the Trinity. *De Iríndate,* bk. v (all the book).

[8] See above, the division of the treatise in the *Sum. th.,* p. 557.

one from the other and the two *notional* or personal *acts,* i e the acts by winch the persons are produced'; of the *names* proper to the persons 3 and the names that are appropriated to them, as4 well as the rules concerning the manner of speaking of the Trinity*· lastly of the *divine missions* in general 6, and particularly of the invisible missions of the Son and the Holy Ghost in souls7.

IV. CREATION. ANGELS AND MEN.

A). Creation and the government of created beings8.*

In proving the existence of God, St. Thomas establishes that He is the Creator of the universe. Having dealt with His nature and operations *ad intra* (Trinity) he considers His operations *ad extra,* and first, the very act of creation9. This act is the only and necessary explanation of all that exists outside of God, not only of the universality of beings10, but also of their totality *(totius esse).* Creation is production *ex nihilo11.* There is no preliminary matter, nor derivation of the divine substance in the created thing· in which creation " is no other than a relation to the Creator as to the principle of its being"12. This work is accomplished by the three Persons, i. e., by the Divine Nature *13, and it cannot be carried out by any other person: to create means to produce being as such, the most universal of all effects. This power, a privilege that is exclusive to the divinity, cannot be shared by a creature m, even in the rôle of instrumental cause, since in creation there is no pre-existing subject *5. According to the Scriptures, creation, in fact, took place in time, but it cannot be rationally proved that such was necessary: both as regards creatures and as regards God the principles of this demonstration escape the human intelligence16.

1 *Ibid.,* q. 32. There are 5 notions: *innascibiltty* and *paternity,* filiation, active *spiration* and passive spiration or *procession* (art. 3). — 2 *Ibid.,* q. 41.

3 *Ibid.,* q. 33-38. — 4 *Ibid.,* q. 39, a. 7. — * *Ibid.,* q. 39, a. I-S.

6 *Ibid.,* q. 43, a. i-S. — 7 *Ibid.,* a. 3, 5. 6. — 8 *Sum. th.,* I, q. 44*49» i°3*H9.

' *Ibid.,* q. 44-46. —,o *Ibid.,* q. 44, a. 1-2. — 11 *Ibid.,* q. 45, a. I.

13 *Ibid.,* q. 45, a. 3. — 13 *Ibid.,* q. 45, a. 6.

'* *Ibid.,* q. 45, a. 5. St. Thomas thus excludes all the Gnostic theories on Demiurges.

15 *Ibid.,* P. Lombard maintained the contrary and his opinion was adopted by Suarez and Vasquez.

*e *Ibid.,* q. 46. R. 2. A demonstration based on created things would be based on their essence: but this essence, as such, exists apart from time. Demonstration from the divine angle would have to be based on God's will which cannot be known save by revelation, except in matters that are absolute, and this is not the case. In consequence, St. Thomas does not admit as evident any

God the Creator is also the universal Exemplary Cause. All things possess a certain finite participation in the being of God, in Whom all created perfection pre-exists because He is the supereminent cause. This is especially a participation in the *idea* that God has had from all eternity of all possible being and which He creates in reality at the time ordained by His Wisdom [*]. In consequence every created thing bears a *likeness* to God; it is even possible to find traces of resemblance *(vestigia)* to the Trinity[9]. Man has a likeness to God and the Trinity in a very special way[3]. Moreover, the whole creation has but a single goal, one end, and that is God. As the Perfect Being, God lacks nothing, but rather communicates His perfection and goodness; it is the law of created things to seek perfection by assimilation to the divine goodness, the end of all things [4].

Not only is God the Creator and Exemplar; He is also the Providence that rules the universes and all the beings that it contains. He preserves their being by His power (a privilege that is as incommunicable as that of creation)[6]; He also moves them to perform their operations and this divine movement attains even to created intelligence and will[7]; He accomplishes everything that is done by all things, not *alone,* but together *with* secondary causes, producing in each creature its most profound element, its very being[8][9][10]. This divine activity says St. Thomas is prior to the creature's activity both logically and in the order of causation[9]; hence the name of *premotion* given it by the Thomists [10]. Further, God makes frequent use of intermediaries in the government of his creatures. In particular he employs His angels, according to the Scriptural teaching summarised by Dionysius the Areopagite, and used by St. Thomas in the following treatise [IX].

repugnance to creation *ab (eterno,* even after having taught *{Sum. th.,* I, q. 7, a. 4), a repugnance to an infinite multitude *in act,* even *per accidens.* See also the opusculum *De ceternitate mundi* (1270) and the *Contra Gentes,* il, c. 31-38. This opinion of St. Thomas is contradicted by St. Bonaventure (see p. 511). Scotus hesitates; Suarez leans to the contrary theory. See L. Mahieu, *F, Suarez,* p. 427.

[1] *Sum. ih.,* I, q. 44, a. 3. Cf. *ibid.,* q. 15, a. I.

[2] Cf. *ibid.,* q. 45, a. 7. — [3] *Ibid.,* q. 93, a. 1-9.

[4] *Ibid.,* q. 44, a. 4. — [5] *Ibid.,* q. 103-II9.

[6] *Ibid.,* q. 104, a. 1-2. Cf. IIIa, q. 13, a. 2.

[7] *Ibid.,* q. 8, a. I ; q. 45, a. 5 ; q. 105, a. 3-4.

[8] Deus est proprie causa ipsius esse universalis in rebus omnibus, quod inter omnia est magis intimum rebus. *Ibid.,* q. 105, a. 5.

[9] .Motio autem moventis præcedit motum mobilis ratione et causa. *C. Gentes,* III, c. 149.

[10] See above, p. 589. This teaching was mainly discussed in the XVith century. See below, p. 754.

[11] See above, p. 89 and 99.

B). The Angels.

The treatise on angels [1] is the first great theological synthesis to be composed on this subject. It may be wondered whether St. Thomas' outstanding teaching in this matter earned him the title of *Angelic Doctor.* What at least is certain, is that his genius as a metaphysician and psychologist found itself thoroughly at home in these questions and he was able to construct an entire doctrinal system that admirably co-ordinated the data of Scripture and Tradition. He was indebted to Dionysius for his teaching on the celestial hierarchies; but as regards the knowledge of the angels, on which he dwells at length, he made great play with his own general psychological teaching. Duns Scotus and later Suarez, starting from different philosophical principles, each constructed another theological doctrine concerning the angels. These still have their exponents[2]. At this juncture we will do no more than recall the outstanding elements of the Thomist teaching

Angels are pure spirits in whom no composition of matter and form is admissible [3]. It follows that as individuals they are not distinguishable by their matter, but by the species proper to each [4]. Did no corporeal being exist, it is possible that angels would not be localised in space; but since in fact they are localised, this is not in the circumscribed manner of bodies but by the application of their " virtue" with respect to an object situated in a determined place[5]. They move by transferring their activity from one localised object to another[6].

Angels are endowed with intelligence and will, faculties that must not be identified with their essence[7]. An angel *knows* himself without intelligible species[8] and knows God (naturally) Whose image he is, without direct vision but also without discursive reasoning[9]. He does not know by means of his own knowledge any other object, even other angels, but by means of infused species [10] which are more universal in the higher hierarchies ". This knowledge, being intuitive, is extremely perfect It does not, however, extend of itself to future contingents, the secrets of the heart and the mysteries of grace*[3]. In spite of the perfection of his knowledge and the natural inclination of his will to universal good, the angel is free, and did, in fact, sin:

1 In the *Sum. th.y* I, q. 50-64 and 106-114.

3 See A. Vacant, *Angiologie,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 1328-1348.

3 *Sum. th.,* I, q. 50, a. 1-2. — 4 *Ibid.,* a. 4.

5 *Ibid.,* q. 52, a. I. — 6 *Ibid.,* q. 53, a. I. — 7 *Ibid.,* q. 54 and q. 59.

1 Ibid.y q. 56, a. I. — 9 *Ibid.,* q. 56, a. 3.

10 Ibid., q 55 a. 2. Nevertheless, he can possess an analogical knowledge of angels and bodies per essentiam suam ", q. íi, a. I ad t

" *Ibid.,* q. 55, a. 3. — ■■ Λ<<, q, 55> a. 34 <<

■■ *Sum. th.,* q. 57, a. 3.5. On the language of the angels, see *ibid.,* q. T07.

once rooted in good or in evil, however, the angel is irrevocably determined with regard to his last end [*].

Angels were created in a true state of happiness or perfection [2], but they had need of grace in order to turn to God and were probably created in a state of grace[3]. Glory, like grace, was proportionate to their natural perfection[4]. Christ is the ruler of the angels and influences them, though He neither became flesh, nor merited grace, for them [5].

In the steps of Dionysius the Areopagite, St. Thomas distinguishes nine choirs óf angels and associates them in some sort with God s government of the universe [6]. The first hierarchy contemplates God, that it may see in Him the supreme reasons for the order of the universe; the second governs the world by means of general causes, whilst the third sees to the carrying out of the divine commands in detail[7]. Men are the object of a special solicitude on the part of Providence which often governs them through the ministry of the angels : the *guardian angel,* sent to help them[8], protects them against the attacks of the devil[9]; each man has his own angel, from the[10] time of his creation ", or rather, from the time of his birth ", and he is never entirely abandoned in this world [12].

C) Man.

To the treatise on purely spiritual creatures, St. Thomas adds another on *corporeal beings* when he treats of the work of the six days of creation [13]. The *Hexaemeron* is crowned by the creation of man, flesh and spirit, who sums up in himself all that is created. Though inferior to the lowest of pure spirits, by his soul he transcends all that lives in a body. The soul of the plant and even the animal is essentially dependent on matter and perishes with the material elements [15]; but the human soul, intellectual and subsistent, is immortal [16]. In man there is but *one* soul and that is his *substantial form.* In its perfection the soul includes all the virtualities of the vegetative and sentient life of the body and performs all the functions that in other beings are done by imperfect forms [17]. This is one of the fundamental elements of Thomist philosophy and one that was particularly opposed by the Augustinian theologians, accustomed to a more Platonic theory. With less hesitation than his predecessors, St. Thomas distinguished the *faculties* [18]

[1] *Ibid.,* q. 59, a. 3; q. 60, a. 5; q. 74, a. 2. — [3] *Ibid.,* q. 62, a. 1.
[3] *Ibid.,* q. 62, a. 2-3. — [4] *Ibid.,* q. 62, a. 6.
[5] *Sum. th.,* Hl, q. 59, a. 6. *De Veritate,* q. XXIX, a. 4 (ad 5), a. 7 (ad 5). On the fallen angels, see *Sum. th.,* 1, q. 63 (their sin), q. 64 (their punishment).
[6] *Stan, th.,* I, q. 106-114. — [7] *Ibid.,* q. 108, a. 6. — [8] *Ibid.,* q. 113.
[9] *Ibid.,* q. 114. — [10] *Ibid.,* q. 113, a. 2. — " *In II Sent.,* D. XI, q. I, a. 3.
[n] *Sum. th.,* q. 113, a. 5. — [13] *Ibid.,* q. 113, a. 6. — [14] *Ibid.,* q. 65-74.
[,J] *Ibid.,* q. 75, a. 3. — [‘6] *Ibid.,* q. 75, a. I, 2, 6.
[17] *Sum. theoi.,* q. 76, a. 1-4. — [,8] *Ibid.,* q. 77*^3·

from the essence of the soul and classified them according to the nature of their immediate operation \ paying particular attention to the higher faculties, the principles of intellection 2 and will 3.

The human intellect is radically *passive,* made to receive any knowable object4, yet it also contains a true and distinct active power *(active intellect)s.* On the other hand there are no grounds for distinguishing *memory* or *reason* from the *intellect**l. Similarly, the *superior* reason, characterised by wisdom, and the *inferior* reason which is concerned with knowledge, are to distinguished only so far as their functions differ 7. *Syndetesis* itself is not a distinct faculty so much as a natural *habitus* of the superior reason, manifesting the primary principles of morality8: it is sometimes called *conscience.* This latter term, however, signifies the actual application of the principles in every-day life rather than their *habitus*9. As may be seen, St. Thomas, despite the sharpness of his distinctions, does no more than is needful. We have referred above to the actual process of knowledge or the application of the intellect to its object,0.

Of itself the will is inferior to the intelligence on account of the manner of its operation (it tends towards its object instead of possessing it *within itself* as is the case for the intelligence) and because its act depends on the intelligence, according to the adage: *nil volitum nisi prcrcognitum* ,a. Nevertheless the will is superior from certain standpoints: the love of God, for instance, is greater than knowledge, for in our present state God is known only through the medium of ideas, while He is directly attained by the supernaturalised will. Further, the will, in order to achieve its end, can also move the intelligence as well as several other faculties by forcing it to act *(per modum agentis);* this of course gives it a relative superiority'3. From an absolute standpoint, however, the intelligence is the greater. Thomist intellectualism is even more evident in its explanation of the *free act.* The principle of this act is freewill, which is not a mere *habitus* but a true facu ty, the will itself inasmuch as it chooses *4; for the act proper to freewill is choice 's. The will is naturally determined with regard to absolute and universal good but not as regards particular goods having no necessary connection with the last end '6. The willl is thus able to make a choice which is always specified by the *ultimate practical judgment.* The latter, of course, is ultimate, precisely because the will makes it so, but the decision is invariably taken on rational grounds '7. Liberty, therefore, though residing formally in the will is also deeply rooted in the intelligence ,8.

' *Ibid.,* q. 78. — 2 *Ibid.,* q. 79. — 3 *Ibid.,* q. 81. — 4 *Ibid.,* q. 79, a. 2.
s *Ibid.,* q. 79, a. 3-4. — 6 *Ibid.,* q. 79, a. 7-8.
7 *Ibid.,* q. 79, a. 9. See vol. I, p. 647. —8 *Ibid.,* q. 79, a. 12.
9 *Ibid.,* q. 79, a. 13. —10 *See*abo*ve, p. 577-578.
" *Stan, th.,* q. 82, a. 3. Cf. *ibid.,* q. 16, a. I; q. 27, a. 4. — ,a *Ibid.,* q. 82, a. 4.
'' *Ibid.,* art. 3-4. — « *Sian. th.,* I, q. 83, a. 4. — «5 */bid.,* q. 83, a. I, 2, 3.
,e *Ibid.,* q. 82, a. 1-2. Cf. *De Veritate,* q. 23, a. 5.
, a' 3 ' Q IC5› a· 4· Cf. liMi* q. 9-10, 13-14. For a detailed and subtle analysis of the acts of intelligence and will that precede election, see below, p. 599. —18 *C. Gentes,* π, 47, 48.

The dignity of man derives chiefly from his soul which is spiritual in its essence and directly created by God r, though not drawn from His substancel1 Even man's body in general is more perfect than the animal's, because it is entirely adapted to the soul and its operations3. This dignity of man is stressed in the scriptural story of his creation 4 which shows him to be the image of God. This *divine likeness,* which we call *images,* exists only in intelligent beings6;*in angels more than in men, though in minor ways men reflect the perfections of God more than the angels, in the omnipresence of the soul and in generation for instance 7. Taken as an imitation of God by intelligence and love, this image exists in all men as a capacity; as an imperfect reality in the just and a perfect reality in the blessed 8.* Man may also be said to be an *image of the Trinity* as regards the spiritual part of his soul *(mens)* considered chiefly in its acts ; the act of knowledge, expressed through an idea or word, and the act of love 9. Trinitarian theology finds a splendid confirmation in this symbol borrowed from St. Augustine I0.* The dignity of man is manifested to an even greater measure in his elevation to a *supernatural* state, and St. Thomas brings the treatise to an end with a study of the privileges possessed by man in the state of innocence ". The loss of these privileges by *orignal sin* as well as the nature of their restoration to all men, is studied in the Unci Part; their redemption is treated in the Hird Part12

V. THOMIST MORAL TEACHING13.

A). General principles.

In the Prima Secundæ St. Thomas has best brought together the general principles of *Moral Theology* i. e., all

I Sum. th., I, q. 90, a. 2-3. — a *Ibid.,* a. I. —3 *Ibid.,* q. 91, a. 3%
Ibid., a. 4. —5 *Ibid.,* q. 93, art. 1-9. — 6 *Ibid.,* a. 2.
7The soul pervades the entire body, just as God is everywhere present; man is born of man " as God is of God *Ibid.,* q. 93, a. 3. — 8 *Ibid.,* q. 93, a. 4.
5 *Ibid.,* a. 5, 6, 7, 8. —10 See vol. I, p. 646-648, and 675.
II Sum. th., I, q. 94-102. —xa See below, p. 626.
*3 The better to conform to current practice we shall group this teaching of lhe Ha in 3 treatises: I. *moral theology·;* 2. the *theology of grace,* comprised in what is usually termed "dogmatic theology1'; and here we will treat *mystical theology;* 3. *ascetic theology.*—These useful classifications in no wise prejudice the radical unity of theology.

the rules concerning the actions by which man, created by God, returns to his author who is his last end. Such is the starting point of the treatise : God, our happiness or end. The Angelic Doctor causes man to reflect on himself in order to discover this end, rising gradually by means of a psychological process to the *law,* the supreme measure of human acts. There exists perhaps no other work so carefully planned as this part of the *Sm/u/ia,* in which all the elements are so closely knit. Nor should its importance be diminished by regarding it as a study in natural ethics, despite the fact that each treatise contains a great deal of philosophical data. I. The knowledge of happiness is found to be the result of an exact knowledge of self. The man who desires to produce acts truly worthy of his free and intelligent nature, in a word, human acts, must act in view of an end x. The end gives specification to acts, both, moral and human2. In this order as well as in the order of being, it is possible to have subordinated ends, but so that the action should possess a definite term of reference there must exist *a last end** perfecting the whole man, and to which the potentialities of each and every man must tend 4.

Together with St. Augustine in whose steps he faithfully advances in this treatise on happiness s, St. Thomas goes on to show that created good cannot give happiness to man6 because the object of his will is *universalgood,* just as universal truth is the object of his intelligence,... and this good is found only in God"7. God. is our happiness considered as our end and from an objective standpoint. Happiness, however, considered in its essence is a created thing8, an operation that must make man perfect by uniting him to the infinite Good9; and this operation is an *act of the speculative intelligence* apprehending the essence of God10. Further, happiness that is constituted essentially by an intellectual act includes, in addition to its concomitant joy ", other interior12, exterior'3, and even social'4;* advantages. The *acquisition'13* of this happiness is possible'6 in diverse degrees'7 ; imperfectly in this

1 *Sum. theol.,* ia-næ, q. I, a. I.
2 *Ibid.,* a. 3: Nam idem sunt actus morales et actus humani.
3 *Ibid.,* a. 4. — 4 *Ibid.,* a. 5-8.

5 See vol. i, p. 69S. Among the sources of this Thomist doctrine, in addition to St. Augustine, must be cited Boethius (see above, p. 216) and Aristotle (Nichomachean Ethics, bk. I and X). Cf. A. Gardeil, *Béatitude,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 510-513.

6 St. Thomas mentions wealth, honours, glory, power, health, pleasure, and die soul itself. *Sum. th.,* iB-ïtæ, q. 2, art. 1-7. — ? *Ibid.,* art. 8.
8 *Ibid.,* q. 2, a. 1-7. — 9 *Ibid.,* a. 2. —10 *Ibid.,* a. 3-8.
" *Ibid.,* i*-itæ, q. 4, a. 1-2. — « *Ibid.,* a. 3.4. — '3 *Jbid.,* a. C, 6, 7.
14 *Ibid.,* a. 8. — '5 *Ibid.,* i»-n®, q. 5, a. 1-8.
16 *Ibid.,* a. I. — *Ibid.,* a. 2.

world, perfectly in the next with the help of grace which alone can give the vision of the divine essence[2]. It is given by God alone[3], but man obtains it by his merits[4]. All seek happiness, though not all seek true happiness[5]. Such is the firm foundation of all morality. This frank and eudemonistic optimism is truly worthy of a disciple of St. Augustine[6].*

2. As regards human acts we would chiefly mention St. Thomas' profound analysis of *acts elicited* by the will. Moral theologians in general[7] have maintained his teaching in order to explain the genesis of the complete voluntary act. The elements of the latter could, of course, be arranged in a different way from that in which they are set out in the rigid analysis of the *Summa*. In this treatise the intellectualism of the Angelic Doctor[8]* is very evident, for to his mind every act of the will follows on an act of the intelligence which prepares it and makes it possible[9].

In the will alone St. Thomas numbers six: i. *simple* or general *volition* is an instinctive pleasure in every good that is perceived as such[10];* 2. *intention,* following on the first judgment, is a volition to tend towards the good by means still to be decided"; 3. *consent* approves and desires the means proposed by counsel[12]; 4. *election,* following on another practical judgment which in fact becomes the last, chooses die most fitting means[13]: 5. the *application* of the faculties *(usus activus)* follows the *imperium* of reason and then comes execution in which all the faculties collaborate, but which belongs properly to the will[14]; 6. perfect *enjoyment (fruitio)* accompanies the possession of the end, and this pertains to the will[15]. As may have been observed, the first two acts concern the good, or the end in itself; the two that follow regard the means; the last two deal with the execution and its consequences. In addition to these acts elicited by the will, there are those that it commands of other faculties *(actus imperati);* these are either purely interior or mainly exterior[16].

[1] *Ibid.,* a. 3-4. — [2] *Ibid.,* a. 5.
[3] *Ibid.,* a. 6. — [4] *Ibid.,* a. 7.
[5] *Ibid.,* a. 8. — [6] See vol. 1, p. 664 and 698.
[7] Save the Scotists and a few modern theologians.
[8] Si. Thomas' intellectualism, see p. 577 and p. 596.
[9] The acts of the intelligence in question are: 1. a general *idea of* a specific good *(Sion, th.,* Ia-næ, q. 9, a. 1): 2. a general *judgment* on its actual goodness and its possibility (q. 19, a. 3 sq.); 3. *counsel* or deliberation on the means to take (q. 14); 4. a *practical judgment* of the particular value of such and such a means (q. 13, a. 3; q. 14, a. 6); 5. the *imperium* or practical decision to adopt such and such a means (q. 17); 6. the practical *execution (usus passivus)* in which the intelligence plays its part, together with the will (q. 16, a. 1).
[10] *Sum. th., ibid.,* q. 8, a. 2. Appetitus inefficax boni propositi.
[11] *Ibid.,* q. 12. — [12] *Ibid.,* q. 14 and 15.
[13] *Ibid.,* q. 13. — [14] *Ibid.,* q. 16.
[15] *Ibid.,* q. ir. — [16] *Ibid.,* q. 17.

Morality is one of the essential properties of human acts[1], St. Thomas treats of its nature and conditions at the end of this treatise[2]. He teaches that human acts receive their essential moral specification from their object[3]; the end also, as motive cause[4], contributes to this specification, which, in a lesser degree, may also be modified by the *circumstances*[5]. Theoretically, there exist no morally *indifferent acts*. In practice, deliberate acts that are not specified by their object, receive a moral value from the intention of the agent who directs them, either to a due end or not[6-7]. St. Thomas speaks here of a virtual intention, but such implies no more than a constant volition of the last end[7]. It follows that all moral acts are either meritorious or not, not only before men but also before God. All the acts of the just man that are not evil are supernaturally meritorious, even acts that are *in se* indifferent, since habitual grace gives the soul a special relation to God[8].

With acts that are lightly called human St. Thomas connects the passions, "acts that are common to men and to animals"[9-11]. They are acts inasmuch as they are motions of the sensitive appetite; they are moral inasmuch as they are regulated and set in motion by reason. Although they are of themselves amoral they may aggravate the evil of a bad voluntary act, or add to the perfection of one that is good: "for the perfection of moral good requires that man should tend to the good not only in his will but also in his sensible appetite". Following the Peripatetic method, St. Thomas associates the passions with the *concupiscible* appetite (love and hate, desire and aversion, joy and sadness) and with the *irascible* appetite (hope and despair, boldness and fear, and lastly anger). In theory, the passions of the first group whose object is the good as such, precede those of the second whose object is the good that is difficult of obtainment. Nevertheless, in the

[1] *Ibid.*, q. I, a. 3, ad 3. On this capital subject, see the great treatises indicated in num. 9 of the special bibliography (p. 529) especially by Janvier, Lehu, Noble, and also Doni Lottin's studies on *Les éléments de la moralité des actes chez S. Thomas* in *Rev. néo-scol.*, 1922-1923.

[3] *Ibid.*, q. 18-20. — [3*] *Ibid.*, q. 18, a. 2.

[4] *Ibid.*, a. 4. — [5] *Ibid.*, a. 3, 10-11.

[6] *Ibid.*, art. 8-9. St. Bonaventure and the Scotists admit the existence of indifferent acts, even *in individuo*.

[7] "Virtualiter referre omnia in Deum, cadit sub præcepto caritatis; cum hoc nihil aliud sit quam habere Deum ultimum finem". *Quasi. disfi., De viri, caritatis,* a. 11, ad 3. This is not merely a habitual relation, but a virtual relation, thanks to the human act. Cf. *ibid.*, ad 2.

[8] *Quast, disfi., De malo,* q. 2, a. 5; q. 9. a. 2.

[9] *Sum. th.*, I'-n®, q. 6 (division).

Sum. th., P-uæ, q. 24, a. I. Teaching opposed to Stoicism that holds all passions to lie bad, and to Epicureanism that considers them divine.

[11] *Ibid.*, a. 3. — [13] *Ibid.*, q. 25, a. 1.

order of generation, i. e., the real dependence of these movements in the life of the soul, joy and sadness come last, so that in this order we obtain the following twofold classification: I. *love* and *hale; 2. desire* and *aversion;* 3. *hope* and *despair;* 4. *boldness* and */ear;* 5. *anger* (no correlative) ; 6. *joy* and *sadness l.* St. Thomas considers the two latter, together with hope and fear, as the most important[3] of the passions. Nevertheless, in the explanations that he devotes to each of the passions[3] he is led to give a more lengthy treatment to love, desire, fear and anger[4,5] which from other viewpoints deserve particular attention.

3. The acts are directly elicited by the faculties. Various intrinsic or extrinsic principles, however, may also contribute to their production. St. Thomas gives the name of habits [5] to all the INTERNAL PRINCIPLES that are permanently associated with the faculties in order to make the production of acts easier or more perfect[6,7] This word, which sometimes signifies a reality in the order of being [7], is here taken to mean an *operative quality,* though in a wider connotation since it covers the natural and supernatural *virtues,* the *gifts* of the Holy Ghost, and even *vices* that lead the soul to sin. Habits, that may be classified in various ways[8,*] are mainly divided from a moral standpoint into *good habits* or virtues (to which are connected the gifts), and *bad habits* or vices [9].

λ) St. Thomas defines virtue: *Bona qualitas mentis qua recte vivitur, qua nullus male utitur, quam Deus in nobis sine nobis operatur* [10]. This last qualification, of course, restrains the definition to the infused virtues, which, though found at the apex of the hierarchy of virtues established by St. Thomas, do not directly represent all the kinds of virtue that he mentions. All virtues, however, are included in the first part of the definition : a good operative habit and a principle that can be used only for the good : all evil, even excessive, is incompatible with it, and can in no way he attributed to it.

1 *Ibid.,* a. 3. — 2 *Ibid.,* a. 4. — 3 *Ibid.,* q. 26-48.

4 See above, the analysis of the *Sumina,* p. 560.

5Stun, th., la-ilæ, q. 49-54.

6 Or even simply possible in the case of an infused habit, without which nothing can be accomplished in the supernatural order.

7 Sanctifying grace for instance.

8 Having treated of the nature, subject and causes of habits, St. Thomas classifies them variously in q. 54.

9 *Sum. th.,* a. 3.

10 *Ibid.,* q. 55, a. 4. Cf. *ibid.,* q. 63, a. 2. This definition of virtue is compiled from several of St. Augustine's texts, mainly drawn from the *De libero arbitrio,* II, c. XIX, 50.

Virtues may be divided into three classes according to the *object* they enable the faculties to attain : intellectual, moral and theological. —Speculative intellectual virtues * are to be distinguished not only from art, but also from prudence2; they perfect the mind for the acquisition of truth: these are *intelligence* which apprehends the primary principles, *knowledge* that derives particular conclusions from them, *wisdom* which, through them, attains to God3. *Prudence,* though an intellectual virtue inasmuch as it is a perfection of the mind, is moral inasmuch as it guides the will. The moral virtues4 that perfect the will in its quest for good5, were especially grouped6 by early writers7 around the four principal or so-called *cardinal* virtues8, which are not only the general conditions of all good human acts9 but also truly distinct habits rendering perfect a special faculty with regard to a specific object: *prudence* directs the practical intellect in its choice of means for the acquisition of good 10 ; *justice* inclines the will to render to each his due; *fortitude* strengthens the irascible appetite while *temperance* moderates the concupiscible apetite11.*—The THEOLOGICAL virtues render man's faculties of intelligence and will proportionate to his supernatural end, that is to say, to God Himself: through them the soul apprehends God as He reveals Himself *(faith)* as He promises to give Himself *(hope)* and as a good already possessed *(charity)* 13.*

These last virtues are essentially infused, since they place man on the same plane as his supernatural end13; but even the *cardinal* virtues that may be acquired by repetition *of* acts, call for an infused habit directing moral activity to the same end M. All this supernatural organism is closely associated with sanctifying grace which will be treated elsewhere'5. The same is to be said of the *gifts of the Holy Ghost* and their concomitant graces.

The growth of infused virtues depends on divine activity; but the other virtues, like the habits, are developed by the repetition of acts, provided of course that these are more intense than the existing habit '6. The four cardinal virtues are closely *linked* together 17 even in their growth and all the actions of the soul's moral life are connected with them as subjective or potential *partes integrantes'**. All of them,

1 Sum. th., Ia-Ilæ, q. 57, a. 1. — 2 *Ibid.,* a. 3-6.

3 Ibid., a. 2. — 4 *Ibid.,* q. 58 61.

5 Ibid., q. 58, a. 1. They are distinguished from the passions in the following question.

6 In question 60 they are otherwise classified.

7 Aristotle, Cicero, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine. See vol. I, p. 541, 699.

8 Sum. th., ia-næ, q. 61, a. 1-4.

9 Ibid., a. 4. — ,0 Recta ratio agibilium. *Ibid.,* q. 57, a. 4-5.

II Ibid., q. 61, a. 2. —13 *Sum. th.,* q. 62, a. 1-4. —13*Ibid.,* q. 62, a. 1.

14 Ibid., q. 63, a. 2-3. — 15 See below, p. 610.

16 Ibid., q. 52, a.2-3. —17 *Ibid.,* q. 65, a. I.

10 Ibid., q. 57, art. 6, ad 4. The *partes integrantes*are thoseelements which though not constituting the essence of a virtue, are intimately bound up with it as dispositions or necessary complements : such is docility with regard to prudence ; *subjective* parts are species such as abstinence and sobriety with regard to temperance; the *potential* parts are connected virtues, such as piety and veracity with regard to justice.

moreover, from a supernatural standpoint, are rigorously dependent on the theological virtues and especially charity[1]. The acts of the moral and intellectual virtues must occupy a *middle place* between excess and defect, hence the maxim : *in medio stat virtus*[2]; but strictly speaking there can be no excess in the theological virtues[3].

Æ) Together with virtuous habits that lead men to good, St. Thomas speaks of *evil habits* that cause him to turn from it : these are the vices, and St. Thomas, at this juncture, treats of sin which is the consequence[4]. There are, of course, other CAUSES OF SIN[5]. The Angelic Doctor cites: I. *ignorance*[6], which may lead to sin and even be a sin itself, just as it may excuse from sin either entirely or in part; 2. the *passions*[7] which act indirectly on the soul, sometimes aggravating, sometimes diminishing, the gravity of sin; 3. pure *malice**, which is of exceptional gravity; 4. lastly, the *devils* who does not directly compel, but suggests evil by acting on the sentient faculties of the soul. God is never the cause of sin, and it is not in this sense that He is said to blind the wicked and harden their hearts[10]. Nevertheless, whatever may be the influence of the foregoing causes, the most proximate and powerful principles of sin are what is precisely termed VICES or CAPITAL SINS ". Vice may be considered simultaneously both as a habit and as an act; the latter is worse than the habit[12],* which is born and grows by means of acts '[13]. Pride and avarice are at the root, but there are also others; to the number of seven according to St. Gregory : *vainglory* (similar to pride) *envy, anger, greed, sloth, gluttony* and *lust.* Though this division is not adequate, St. Thomas attempts to justify it and finds in this list the main causes of sin *[14]. These are studied elsewhere in more detail [15].

Sin is therefore considered here mainly in its causes and particularly vice : inasmuch as it is an act, however, it is also treated at the same time[16]. St. Thomas confirms *[17]

[1] *Ibid.,* q. 65, a. 2-5. — [2] *Ibid.,* q. 54, a. 1-3.
[3] *Ibid.,* a. 4. — [4] *Ibid.,* q. 71-89.
[5] *Ibid.,* q. 75 : causes of sin in general. — [6] *Ibid.,* q. 76, a. 1-4.
[7] *Ibid.,* q. 77, a. 1-8. See art. 5, the three concupiscences.
[8] *Ibid.,* P-Ilæ, q. 78, a. I-4. —[9] *Ibid.,* q. 80, a. I-3.
[10] *Ibid.,* q. 79, a. 1-4. — [11] *Ibid.,* q. 84.
[12] *Ibid.,* q. 71, a. 3. Potior est actus in bonitate vel malitia quam habitus, quia propter quod unumquodque tale et illud magis.
[13] *Ibid.,* q. 51, a. 2. — [14] *Ibid.,* q. 84, a. I-4.
[15] See *passim.* Cf. *Quast. disp.; De malo,* q. 8-15 (above p. 548).
[16] *Ibid.,* q. 71, a. 3. —[17] *Ibid.,* a. 6.

St. Augustine's definition : *Peccatum estfactum, vel dictum, vel concupitum aliquid contra æternam legem* He distinguishes the species of sins according to their object[1].

Two acts referring to the same object may differ considerably as regards their gravity[3], just as illness differs from death. Mortal sin *cuts offfve* sinner from his last end, *aversio ab ultimo fine;* venial sin is a disorder but does not fall into this excess : " Deordinatio citra aversionem a Deo". The chief effects of mortal sin are on the one hand a true diminishing of man from a simply natural viewpoint[4], but mainly in the supernatural order, the stain *(macula)*[3] or state of guilt that derives both from the sin and adhesion to created good. This entails the privation of sanctifying grace and the obligation of undergoing punishment *(reatus poena)* [6] of a certain infinite duration because of the relative infinity of sin[7]. Further, all sins, even mortal, are not equally grave owing to the diversity of secondary positive elements that characterise them as a greater or less aversion to God[8].

Venial sin differs from mortal as something that can be repaired differs from what is absolutely irreparable it is sickness, but not death,[0]; it does not cut the sinner off from God but slows down his advance towards Him" ; it dulls the (actual) brilliance that acts of virtue give to the soul, but not the (habitual) brilliance of grace **. By its consequences, however, it may insensibly lead to mortal sin[13]. Further, like mortal sin, but proportionally, it has a *reatus pance* as its immediate effect,[4]. It may be asked whether these characteristics of venial sin allow it to be distinguished sharply, even "in concreto" from *imperfection.* St. Thomas' opinion on this matter still remains a matter of dispute among Thomists's.

Original sin'[6] is specifically distinct from the *actual sins* of which we have just written. Being a sin of nature, it can be transmitted like nature and with nature '[7]. It consists in a sinful habit, a stain, voluntary in its cause, constituted by the privation of original justice which was meant to submit the will to God: "Tota autem ordinatio originalis justitiae ex hoc est quod voluntas hominis erat Deo subjecta". The formal element of original sin thus lies in the destruction of this order : " Sic ergo privatio originalis justitiæ, per quam voluntas subdebatur Deo, est formale in peccato originali ". Concupiscence, however, comes in as the material element,[8]. The sin lies neither

[1] *Contra Faustum,* bk. XXII, c. 17; *P. L.,* 42, 418.

[9] *Sum. th.,* 1M1®, q. 72, a. i. Scotus prefers to distinguish them according to the contrary virtues and Vasquez according to the precepts they violate.

[3] Differunt in infinitum, */bid.,* art. 5, ad 1.

[*] *Ibid.,* q. 85, a. 1-5. — [5] *Ibid.,* q. 86, a. 1-2.

[6] *ibid.,* q. 87, a. 1-8.

[7] *Ibid.,* art. 4. Cf. in, q. I, a. 2, ad 2: Peccatum contra Deum commissum quamdam infinitatem habet ex infinitate divinæ majestatis.

[8] *Sum. th.,* q. 72› a· 6-9. —[9] *Ibid.,* q. 88, a. I.

[10] *Ibid.,* q. 72, a. 5. — " *In It Sent.,* D. 42, q. I, a. 3, ad 5.

[13] *Ibid.,* q. 89, a. 1. — [13] *Ibid.,* q. 88, a. 3.

[14] *Ibid.,* q. 87, a. 5. —[15] See *Rev. th.,* 1928 and *Full,th.,* p. 393-7QS

[16] *Sum. th.,* 1M1X, q. 81-83. —— *Ibid.,* q. 81, a. I.

[*8] *Ihid.,* q. 82, a. 3.

in the flesh nor even in the faculties, but in the soul [1] and its essence, before it begins to infect the will and the other powers'.

4. In addition to the habits (virtues or vices) that contribute interiorly to the production of acts, there exist also certain EXTERIOR PRINCIPLES that are able to act on the faculties. As we have remarked, the *devil* can influence the soul to evil. *God,* above all, can influence the soul and this in two ways: through His *law* and through His *grace.* The latter will be studied elsewhere [3]. The study of the law [4], however, is essential to moral theology. The law is an ordinance of divine reason imposed on man. St. Thomas defines the *law* in general as: "Quaedam rationis ordinatio ad bonum commune, et ab eo qui curam habet communitatis promulgata" [5]. It compels by means of its commands, prohibitions, permissions and punishments[6]* There are several kinds of law. The highest, from which all others derive and which is known to all, is the *eternal lazo* [7], which is defined: "Ratio divinæ sapientiæ, secundum quod est directiva omnium actuum et motionum" [8][9] *Natural law* is closely bound up with eternal law: "participatio legis æternæ rationali creaturae", a product of that natural reason which consists in "an impression of the divine light within us"[9]. The divine and human *positive laws*™ are based on this fundamental law ir. In the first place come all the divine positive laws of the Old and New Testaments, treated in detail by St. Thomas [12]. He is thus led to speak of *grace* by means of which God, a principle exterior to the soul, i. e., essentially distinct from it, acts upon it profoundly in order to help it to observe the law and accomplish all justice.

B). Application of general principles.

As St. Thomas points out in the Prologue the particular application of general moral principles is important; the explanation of the general principles alone is not enough since human actions are concerned with particular events *[13].

[1] *Ibid.,* q. S3, a. I. — [3] *Ibid.,* art. 2-4. — [3] See below, p. 607 sq.
[4] *Sum. th.,* la-næ, q. 90-108. — [5] *Ibid.,* q. 90, a. 4. — [6] *Ibid.,* q. 92, a. 2.
[7] *Ibid.,* q. 93, a. 1-6. Cf. q. 91, a. I. — [8] *Ibid.,* q. 91, a. I.
[9] *Ibid.,* q. 91, a. 2. — [10] *Ibid.,* q. 95-97.
[11] *Ibid.,* q. 94, a. 1-4. — [12] *Ibid.,* q. 98-105 and 106-108.
[13] Sermones enim morales universales minus sunt utiles, eo quod actiones in particularibus sunt.

The Angelic Doctor does not of course deny the usefulness and necessity of universal data which he treats at such length, but he vigorously asserts the need of applying them in any complete moral education. His method nevertheless remains essentially doctrinal. He is concerned less with giving practical solutions of cases [1] of conscience than with throwing light on each object so that it may be apprehended the more easily in its natural and supernatural aspects[2]. Hence the importance of his classifications. This is the only point we shall touch upon here. Greater detail may be found in more specialised treatises.

St. Thomas groups the infinite number of matters that come under the head of moral theology around the seven virtues: the three *theological* virtues and the four *cardinal* virtues. By means of this classification he constructs a rigorous synthesis on a logical basis [3]: the distinction of diverse formal objects [4] which give a moral specification to human acts and also the virtues from which the acts proceed. So eminent are some of these objects that it becomes an easy matter to link up all others with them. The division that is thus established is adequate [5] and avoids repetition. It is, of course, mainly *theoretical,* since objects are classified according to their nature[6] rather than according to the order of the acquisition of good habits by the soul. Nevertheless, the theory of the virtues easily lends itself to more ample ascetic developments of a practical nature and in practice it is possible to base an entire *ascetic theology* on St. Thomas' moral teaching.

[1] There already existed practical *Summae* in the Xinth cent., see below, p.639.

[2] Even in these matters, in addition to the Fathers and particularly St. Augustine, he frequently quotes the Pagan philosophers, mainly Aristotle, whose name occurs more than Soo times (the Nichomachean Ethics are cited more titan 600 times).

[3] Much superior, from this point of view, to the division based on the commandments of God or the persons affected by human acts (God, our neighbour and ourselves).

[4] The same object considered from a material an^le may give rise to ven* different acts: a coin given to a poor man is an alms, given to a murderer it may signify co-operation in his crime : it is this ultimate formality of the object, the formal object, that determines the morality of an act.

[5] Comprising all objects in general, but also capable of including very special objects as may be seen below.

[6] See detailed explanations in the great moralists. Fr. Janvier's monumental work is to he highly recommended both for the thoroughness and wealth of its matters and the beauty of its style.

Vigorous as is the synthesis, no less admirable is the subtle and varied analysis revealing a wonderful variety of virtues in human nature. "Virtues of every age, sex and condition; virtues of leaders and subjects, of workers and kings, of soldiers and the heads of nations, of rich and poor, of the lettered and the unlettered: virtues to be found in all, in every man, in each one of us, for they adapt themselves to our very nature, to balance, harmonise, perfect, and move it in the direction of its supreme goal!—See, for instance, the virtues of great souls: fortitude or courage strengthening the soul against the fear of danger, suffering, and even death ; *magnanimity,* virtue of the great ones of the earth that measures the rational use of dignity and honour; *magnificence,* fellow of opulence which guides the generous use of worldly wealth ; *perseverance* that does not draw back before the length and obstacles of the task.—And now some virtues of "little souls" as St. Theresa of the Child Jesus would call them: *mildness* which restrains the interior impulse of anger; *modesty* tempering the usual actions of everyday life, and above all, *humility,* based on a perfect knowledge of self and the enemy of all unruly desires of self conceit" [1]. All these virtues and the others, "lovely and gracious", or great and noble, or yet again, private, social or public, are associated with the major virtues according to a hierarchy established finely and methodically thanks to the distinction of the three parts (integral subjective and potential) that the Angelic Doctor discovers in every one of them. The simple analysis given above (p. 562-565) of this part of the *Summa theologica* suffices to reveal its wealth of detail.

Special moral theology—which treats in detail, *in specie,* the acts that the common virtues render obligatory for all—becomes extremely special when it attempts to establish the obligations peculiar to certain conditions of men : and with this St. T lomas brings his explanation to an end[2]. These elements will be touched upon when we come to speak of grace and asceticism. The latter are of the utmost importance for those who would acquire an exact notion of Thomist thought concerning the soul's return to God, its beginning and last end.

VI. THEOLOGY OF GRACE.

A). General theology of grace.

Towards the end of the Prima Secundae St. Thomas treats of grace, by which God, an " exterior principle " [3]

1 Mgr E. Van Roey, *Le cortège des vertus, d'après S. Thomas d'A<j.,* in *La revue calli, des idées et desfails,* Brussels, 1924, March 7th, p. 7.

2 ii'-næ, q. 171-189. See analysis of the *Summa,* p. 566.

3Q. 109: De exteriori principio humanorum actuum.—It should be evident that from another viewpoint God is an internal principle of man, within the soul more closely than even the soul is within itself.

to the soul i. e., distinct from the soul, operates within it so that it may act rightly. Here of course St. Thomas refers to the last of the general moral principles. He goes on, however, to speak not only of actual grace but of all grace. The six questions he devotes to this subject, though brief, are a masterly revelation of his genius. At this point we will do no more than trace the gradual progress of his explanation, incorporating in addition a number of matters that were purposely omitted in the foregoing synthesis of his moral teaching.

St. Thomas begins by establishing the necessity of grace* in general, particularly as regards fallen man. Natural *truth* might possibly be attained and known by reason alone[2]* but not supernatural truth [3]. The will even more than the intelligence needs help in its quest for \\\q *good:* without grace, fallen man may possibly accomplish some measure of good, but in order to keep all the precepts and especially that of charity, he has need of a supernatural grace[4][5] The natural powers of man are altogether incapable of meriting him eternal life; lacking a freely bestowed gift of God he can neither prepare himself for supernatural life nor extricate himself fromjf/z[3]. Even the avoidance of all sin is beyond the power of fallen man bereft of sanctifying grace[6]; and in addition to habitual grace the just man has need of special aids to overcome serious temptation and to avoid all sin[7]. Final perseverance in this state is a special gift for which the just man must plead, for it is not granted to all[8].

The essence of grace [9] is seen in its very name. No matter from what angle it is considered, it implies something really existent in the soul : the word grace signifies either goodwill or the gift that follows it, or the gratitude aroused by the latter; but divine grace is truly something real in the soul, not only in the second and third meanings, but also in the first, for, as St. Thomas profoundly remarks, the love of God unlike our love, is not caused by the good He finds outside Himself; rather does it produce the good [10]. Grace precisely indicates this direct action of God on the soul, either inasmuch as it is applied to the essence of the soul *(habitualgraced* or inasmuch as it co-operates directly in the

‘ *Sum. th.,* q. 109, a. I-10.

2 Though certain truths that are especially necessary and important gain by the fact that they are also revealed, and die human race as a whole must (morally) receive them through this medium. UMI®, q. 2, a. 4. *C. Gentes,* I, c. 4. See Garr IGOU-La GRANGE, *De Revelatione,* p. 411-412.

3 *Sum. th.,* q. 109, a. I.

4 *Ibid.,* art. 2-4 On the natural love of God possible to man, see *ibid.,* a. 3.

5 *Sum. th.,* art. 5-7. — 4 *Jbid.,* a. 8. —*1 Ibid.,* a. 9.

8 *Ibid.,* a. 10. *Ibid.,* q. no, a. 1-4. — *Ibid.,* a. I.

production of acts *(actual grace)'*. Here lies the essential distinction to which all others are subordinated [2], even the important distinction between operating grace and co-operating grace *(gratia operans* and *cooperans)**.

St. Thomas conceives actual grace as essentially a *gratuitous motion* of the faculties and consequently differing from mere natural co-operation [4] as it is also distinct from habitual graces which helps man to know, will, and act. Since action is the complement of willing, a greater stress is laid on those actual graces that present truth to the intelligence, and good to the will[6].* Grace is termed *operatitig* when it contributes to the production of the first acts that precede and induce deliberation [5]: when, as it were, God alone is acting since the soul does not yet move itself (in ilio ergo effectu... mens nostra est mota et non movens, solus autem Deus movens); it is called *co-operation* when the divine movement is accompanied by the deliberate action of the will (in illo autem effectu... mens nostra et movet, et movetur): here, the will is moved by God and *moves itself,* at least by producing other internal acts and also the external acts that depend on it [7]. Such is the radical distinction [8] established by St. Thomas to indicate the modalities of the divine action contributing to man's supernatural activity.

The nature of this activity is shown in tbe word *movement* and this term naturally suggests the general principles laid down by St. Thomas on the subject of movement[9]. Elsewhere he explicitly states that the

* *Ibid.,* a. 2. Since the infused virtues and the gifts are produced by God alone in the soul, St. Thomas sometimes calls them also grace *(Sum. th.,* IIIa, q. 62, a. 2), but treats them in his explanation of habits.

[3] *Ibid.,* q. in *(De divisione gratia:),* a. 1-5.

[3] Grace in the true sense of which we treat here is termed *gratum faciens* as opposed to grace *gratis data,* which for St. Thomas signifies only those *charismata* that are granted for the benefit of others *(Ibid.,* a. I, 4, 5); this meaning is now current in theology. Early theologians often called true actual grace by the name of *gratia gratis data.* See above, p. 519.

[4] *Ibid.,* q. 109, a. i. Effectus gratuitæ Dei voluntatis. *Ibid.,* q. no, a. 2. But *"gratuita"* is not synonymous with *"gratis data"* in the above mentioned technical sense.

[5] *Ibid.,* q. no, a. 2. St. Thomas shows himself less rigorous as regards the existence and need of actual grace in *II Sent.,* D. 28, q. I, a. 4. But see for the contrary *Quodtibet,* 1, a. 7.

[6] See above, *necessity ofgrace.*

[7] *Ibid.,* q. in, a. 2. See vol. I, p. 684. According to certain theologians operating grace is that which produces internal acts, while the other produces external acts.

[2] See *ibid.,* a. 3, the secondary division of grace into prevenient and subsequent grace. —[9] See above, p. 589 and p. 595.

will is moved either by the attraction of an object presented to it by the intelligence (objective action, *per specificationem},* or by an interior inclination (subjective action, *ad exercitiuni)* that can proceed only from God or the will itself[3] In the true sense of the word, this last mentioned divine operation is a "movement of God" acting "as efficient cause"[1]. With greater precision, later Thomist theology has called it "physical premotion" and even "physical predetermination"[2] Similarly, it teaches this grace to be efficacious of itself *(ab intrinseco sui)* and establishes the famous distinction between efficacious and sufficient grace[4],*in keeping with the principles of St. Thomas.

Habitual grace is neither a substance[5] nor a substantial form, but an "*accidental form*", a permanent quality placed by God *in the very essence* of the soul "which causes it to participate, by means of a certain likeness, in the divine nature"[6]. Grace, therefore, is not a virtue, not even the virtue of charity, but it is the foundation of all the infused virtues. Like the natural light of reason that forms the basis of the acquired intellectual virtues, "the light of grace which is a participation in the divine nature is something distinct from the infused virtues that derive from it"[7]. It is a gift by which "the very nature of man is raised to a measure of dignity that places it in the same plane as its (supernatural) end"[8].* Just as the faculties, principles of operation, derive from nature, "so, in the faculties of the soul, do the virtues that move them in their actions (supernatural) derive from grace"[9]. Habitual grace is thus, as the theologians say, a quasi-nature. Considered from the viewpoint of God, Who alone produces it[10], it is nevertheless termed *operating* with regard to its primary effect, the sanctification of the soul, and *co-operating* with regard to the meritorious works which it makes possible,and to which man must actively contribute[11].

The effects of habitual grace are many. i. It destroys sin[12] in such a manner that "the forgiveness of sin would be incomprehensible without the infusion of grace"[13], which "formally"[14] excludes it and that

[1] *Sum. th.,* I*-II®, q. 9, a. I ; q. So, a. I. Cf. I, q. 105, a. 4; q. 106, a. 2.
[a] Per modum causæ efficientis. *De verit.,* q. 22, a. 9.
[3] See below, p.753. — [4] See p. 754.
[5] *Sum. th.,* l*-u®, q. I io, a. 2, ad 2. And even less a divine Person, the Holy Ghost, as Lombard thought, *Ibid.,* ιι·-ιι», q. 23, a. 2. See above p. 459.
[6] *Ibid.,* q. 110, a. 4. — [7] *Sum. th.,* a. 3.
Ipsa natura hominis elevetur ad quamdam dignitatem secundum quam talis finis sit ei competens. *De Veritate,* q. 27, a. 2.
[»] 1*11®, q. 110, a. 3; iu% q. 62, a. 2. — [,o] *Ibid.,* q. 112, a. 2.
[“] *Ibid.,* q. Ill, a. 2. — [”] *Ibid.,* q. 113, a. i-io. — [*3] *Ibid.,* a. 2.
[14] Gratia non expellit culpam effective sed formaliter. *De Verit.,* q. 28, a. 5. Formaliter gratia inhaerendo expellit culpam. *Ibid.,* a. 7, ad 4.

radically*. 2. It unites the soul to God, so that the creature made godlike, shares in a sonship of adoption'. 3. It gives rise to a special presence of God, termed *inhabitation** : this means that God, substantially present to the soul not only as author of nature but also of grace[3] *gives Himself* at least potentially to the soul as object of knowledge, love and enjoyment[5].* 4. Lastly, it is the essential foundation of *merit*°.

Associated with habitual grace are the infused habits. These, as it were, are " supernatural forms or qualities by which God moves him (man) swiftly and smoothly so that he may obtain eternal good " 7, These habits are of two kinds : the infused virtues and the gifts of the Holy Ghost 8.

The infused virtues differ from grace, as from the principle from which they proceed, for it is they that directly render perfect in view of a supernatural activity the faculties in which they are rooted[9];* just as the acquired virtues make them more perfect in view of a natural activity'0. Nevertheless in the same way as the latter bestow but the capacity for action, so do the former provide only the power of operation on the supernatural plane. There are three essentially infused virtues, faith, hope and charity, termed the *theological virtues* ". All, even charity ", are truly distinct from sanctifying grace '3. In addition to these there are four *infused moral virtues,* called the cardinal virtues.

The gifts of the Holy Ghost, says St. Thomas, arc meant to make up for the relative inferiority of the supernatural organism as compared with the natural organism of the faculties. The latter, guided by reason, is perfectly adapted to its natural end. The former with no other guide than reason falls far short of its high supernatural destiny. It was

1 So that Thomists teach that the co-existence of sin and grace in the same subject is even incompatible with the absolute power of God. Suarez moderates this incompatibility in some measure. Scotus does not admit it, and attributes to the will of God the incompatibility of grace and sin *in fact.* See below, p. 660 and p. 665. — 3 ι'-næ, q. no, a. 3 ; q. 114, a. 3.

3See A. Gardeil, *La structure...,* IT, p. 1-87. Van DER Meer SCH, *Digrada,* p. 116-121.

4 Speaking of the three manners of God's presence (by power, presence and essence, integral elements of the*presence of immensity,* says Gardeil), St. Thomas says: "These three ways of God's presence are found in every creature and are implied by all the other modes of presence". *In I Sent.,* D. 37, q. 1, a. 2, ad 3. The simple production of grace remains in the same order of causality, therefore, in the order of presence. Vasqucz reduces this to inhabitation, but St. Thomas considers this point as its foundation and not as its formal element.

5 *Sum. th.,* I, q. 8, a. 3; q. 43, a. 3. This is the formal element of inhabitation; St. Thomas however does not prescind it from the foregoing as do many theologians, even Thomists, in imitation of Suarez.

4Sum. th., i»-næ, q. 114, a. 1-10. See J. Rivière, *Mérite,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 678 sq. — 7 *Sum. th.,* q. no, a. 2.

8 See above, p. 602. — 0 *Ibid.,* q. no, art. 4.

,e*Ibid.,* art. 3. — 11 **Ibid.,* q. 62, a. 1-4. See above p. 602.

" Duns Scotus does not distinguish sanctifying grace from charity, as he does not distinguish the faculties from the essence of the soul in the natural order. See below, p. 659. — 13 *Ibid.,* q. no, a. 3-4.

fitting that God should sometimes intervene directly in order to place the supernatural organism on the same footing as the natural. In consequence, He places in the soul eminent infused habits, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, in order to make it capable of receiving His activity*. Thanks to them the soul acts under the influence of a divine compulsion, as if moved "by a touch of the Holy Ghost"'. The divine activity to which they respond is thus more intense than that of ordinary actual grace, but like the latter, it reaches the mind by means of the gifts of *understanding wisdom, counsel* and *knowledge,* and the will by means of *piety,jear of the Lord,* and *fortitude*[3][4]

The Holy Ghost thus subjects the soul to His action, only in order to make it act more perfectly in every kind of virtue[4]. These perfect acts are called *beatitudes* and *fruits*[5], as we shall see in the following pages on mystical theology, for though the use of the gifts is possible in every state, it takes place normally in the perfect state, in the form of *mystical graces.*

B). Mystical Theology[6].

In a general manner those graces are termed mystical that put the soul into close communication with God, not only by raising the soul in its essence, faculties, and acts to a supernatural plane, but also by bestowing upon it a certain experimental perception or knowledge of God and His perfections or by making known His will. Such kinds of knowledge, provided they are real, can only be received, and not acquired, for God is an infinitely transcendant Being. He is able nevertheless to communicate Himself by means of eminent graces. The *gifts of the Holy Ghost* are meant precisely for the purpose of submitting man to God, even constantly, so that he may receive divine enlightenment and inspiration. It is evident, further, that God may also intervene in other and *extraordinary* way's. This special intervention is in fact obvious in the lives of the saints[7].

' *Sum. th.,* q. 68, a. 2. — 7 *Ibid.,* a. 2, ad 2. — 3 *Ibid.,* a. 4.

4 Hence the care with which St. Thomas (iP-næ) associates the gifts with the virtues: with faith, *understanding* (q. 8) and *knowledge* (q. 9); with hope, *ftar* (q. 19); with charity, *wisdom* (q. 45); with prudence, *counsel* (q. 52); with justice, *piety* (q. I21), with fortitude, the *gift offortitude* (q. 139).

5 *Sum. th.,* IMI®, q. 69-70.

6 See *Elementary Notions,* in the General Introduction (vol. I, p. 19-20) and the Introduction to Book IV (above, p. 359).

Authors are far from being agreed concerning what mystical phenomena are *ordinaty* (though eminent, heroic and very rare in practice) and what are *extraordinary* (therefore not requisite to holiness). It is certain that the majority of mystical phenomena find their theological explanation in the gifts, as w'e shall

All the gifts of the Holy Ghost cause man to act under divine inspiration though not every one puts him into direct communication with it, since some of them have not God for their object. Such in the first place are the three gifts that touch the will : *fear* has for its immediate object the evil that proceeds from sin, not the evil of punishment, but that which consists in the offense against God *(fear of the Lord)* the object peculiar to *piety* is the filial reverence that must be given to God[2]; the object of *fortitude* is the difficulty of persevering in good and supporting evil A Among the intellectual gifts, two whose function is the perfecting of practical reason, find their objects in created being : *counsel* helps us to acquire an exact knowledge of the means that lead us to God[4]; *knowledge* enables us to judge and appreciate the true worth of created things[5], and in this it differs from *wisdom* and *understanding* whose proper object is God[6]. Not only do they make man subject to divine activity, but also place him in direct communication with God : they are, as it were, the best of the *mystical gifts* and in them is to be found the reason for the majority of the so-called mystical favours of which we read in the lives of the saints. The other gifts also, like the virtues themselves, may dispose the soul to the use of these more eminent gifts[7], and in their turn, receive greater light from them, since the eternal reasons that are known and experienced by understanding and wisdom should, in practice[8], be the guide of all, in spite of the fact that these gifts are primarily speculative.

Understanding (the gift) purifies the secret eye of the heart so that in some measure God may already be seen in this life: "In hac etiam vita, purgato oculo per donum intellectus, Deus quodammodo videri potest" [9]. The general purification of the heart[10] begins with the virtues and the gifts that concern the will, but it pertains to the gift of understanding to complete the work begun "with regard to the vision of God This gift proceeds in two ways; it begins by removing from the mind all anthropomorphic images of God and continues by preserving it from errors that lead to heresy The perfect vision that consists in the intellection of God is reserved for the future life when we

see; further, the close subordination that St. Thomas establishes between the gifts and the virtues, and the care with which he distinguishes them from grace *¿ralis data* which is meant for the sanctification of others, in order to connect them with grace *gratum faciens*, meant for our personal sanctification, clearly shows, that to his mind, their acts are not extraordinary although they may be remarkably exalted. In addition it should be noticed how great a place St. Thomas gives to these gifts in his theology.

[1] *Sum. th.*, q. 19, a. 2. — [2] *Ibid.*, q. 121, a. I. — [3] *Ibid.*, q. 139, a. I.
[4] *Ibid.*, q. 52. a. 2. — [5] *Ibid.*, q. 9, a. 2. — [6] *Ibid.*, q. 8, a. 2; q. 45, a. 2.
[7] *Sum. th.*, iMiæ, q. 8, a. 7; q. 180, a. 2.
[8] *Ibid.*, q. 8, a. 3; q. 45, a. 3. — [9] *Ibid.*, iM1æ, q. 69, a. 2, ad 3.
[10] The entire soul, but especially the mind, intelligence and will.
[11] *Ibid.*, n*-iiæ, q. 8, a. 7.

shall see Him in His essence. Nevertheless, even in this life we see Him, though imperfectly, by understanding what He is not, and the more we can understand that God transcends anything we can possibly conceive, the better do we know Him; the former vision is that of the consummated gift, the latter of the inceptive gift[1]. Moreover, despite its relative character, this knowledge is " an acute perception of divine things"[2] a vision which, though not existing in the same plane, "penetrates the very fastness" of its object, the object of faith[3]. The gift of understanding thus enlightens or purifies the mind by giving it, or in order to give it, the power of penetrating revealed truth by means of an act that becomes ever more simple, and free of sensible entanglement[4].

The gift of intelligence enables the soul to apprehend divine things; the gift of wisdom enables the soul to savour, appreciate and value them, not by means of simple rational knowledge but by an interior affection " a certain connaturality "[5] established between the soul and divine truth. Alluding to an expression of Dionysius the Areopagite, St. Thomas calls this connaturality a "compassion"[6]*and shows that it derives from charity : " Connaturalitas ad res divinas fit per caritatem quæ nos unit Deo, secundum illud: *qui adhærct Deo unus spiritus est* (I Cor., VI, 17) "[7]. Hence the dependence of wisdom on charity which causes it. Essentially however wisdom is an act of the mind, a judgment[8]. It consists in a sentient and experimental knowledge of

1 *Ibia.,* a. 7. — 3 Quædam acuta perspectio divinorum. *Ibid.,* q. 49, a. 2. ad 2.

3 *Ibid.,* q. 8, a. I and 2.

4 The gift of understanding is therefore pre-eminently a gift of purification, yet even this important function remains subordinated to that of wisdom among the mystical graces. In every one, even the first that St. Theresa mentions, the divine savouring or quietude, wisdom appears to be first to act; the gift of understanding, in association with wisdom, appears to play a more active part in the later graces, the prayers of union, and it is possibly its intervention, which differs moreover considerably according to the soul in which it works and the will of God, that gives character and penetration to these prayers. At this point these two gifts, mutually complementary, reach the full development that God desires to give them in each soul or that which the soul is fitted to receive on account of its faithfulness.

5 *Sum. th.,* q. 45, a. 2; per quamdam connaturalitatem.

6 Divina patiens. See alxjve p. 96.

7 *Sum. th.,* iiM1», q. 45. a. 2.

8 Sic ergo sapientia, qua? est donum, causam quidem habet in voluntate, scilicet caritatem; sed essenturi habet in intellectu, cujus actus est recte indicare. *Ibid.,* a. 2.

divine truth. And it is of this that charity is the cause, not of the simple knowledge of the object which is revealed by faith and apprehended by the understanding '. Like the rest of the gifts, that of wisdom is inferior to the theological virtues and especially charity, but it is in the forefront of the gifts, due to its intellectual quality and its close connection with charity in its specific act of judgment2. It possesses, moreover, exceptional practical importance since it directly tends to guide all human acts in conformity with the eternal verities λ

Contemplation 4 is the highest act of wisdom and also of understanding in the measure the latter enters into it. Like wisdom, contemplation according to St. Thomas essentially belongs to the *intellect*3. Its act is simple *(simplex intuitus veritatis)*6, similar to the perception of first principles7. This intuition, nevertheless, apart from some exceptional ecstasy, is not the vision of the divine essence8. It consists in a simple perception of intelligible truth transcending sensible images9, a perception that is strictly proper to the gift of understanding*°. Yet having affirmed lhe intellectual nature of contemplation, the blessed doctor likes to stress the great part that is played by *charity*. It is found at the outset and at the end of contemplation. Front charity derives the ardour in the quest of contemplation and the delight that accompanies it". This delight transcends all other joy for it is spiritual and its entire object is sweet, as is written in the psalm : " *Gustate et videte quoniam suavis est Dominus* (Ps. 33, 6) " ". This joyful union with God in contemplation is the privilege of perfect souls, who, says St. Thomas must endeavour above all to enjoy God *(fruì Deo)* through charity*13.

Contemplation is found in three and unequally perfect forms, compared by St. Thomas to three kinds of movement : one *perfect* (circular), the second *imperfect* (vertical) and the third *mixed* (oblique) *14. 1. The

* Aided by charity the understanding can go further, but this of itself remains an act ol the gift of understanding. Similarly, a more profound intellection may render charity and the appreciation of the judgment more intense, but the latter as such, pertains to the gift of wisdom, even should the two gifts act together in practice, as happens in true contemplation.

9 *Sum. th.,* IMI®, q. 6S, a. 7-8. —' *Ibid.,* 11»·II®, q. 45, a. 3.

4 When treating of the *contemplative life* (q. 180), St. Thomas deals with its specific act i. e., *contemplation,* and correlates all the foregoing data concerning wisdom and understanding. — 5 *Sum. th.,* q. 180, a. 1.

6 *Ibid.,* a. 3. —7 *Ibid.,* a. 3, 6. Cf. q. 8, a. I, ad 2. —8 *Ibid.,* a. 5.

9 *Ibid.* —10 *Sum. th.,* q. 8, a. 7. See above p. 614.

" *Ibid.,* q. 180, a. 1. —13 *Ibid.,* a. 7. — *3 See *Ascetic Theology,* p. 619.

14 The better to understand this explanation we must imagine two planes, one greater or divine, and the other lower or created. The *circular* movement takes place in the higher plane : it is *perfect* both because of this and because it is regular, " without beginning or end ". The *vertical* movement is *imperfect* because it has two distinct and separate limits, without continuity; it proceeds from the lower plane to the higher in a *vertical* direction, so that it is possible to have several vertical parallel motions without any continuity from one to the other. (A horizontal movement on the lower plane would represent any

highest and most perfect form is *contemplation in the true sense of the word,* whose nature according to St. Thomas we have just explained. 2. The imperfect form [1] is rather a simple *meditation* or pious consideration "disposing" the soul to true contemplation. It is in this sense' that St. Thomas understands the first degrees of the series set out by Richard of St. Victor[3] and makes them his own. 3. But in addition, he treats of a contemplation in which are united the two distinctive elements of the two that precede, and which may thus be termed *mixed*[*]*:* on the one hand there is a discursive effort of the mind which works and reasons, and, on the other hand employs more eminent divine illuminations, " Illuminationibus divinis ratiocinando utitur"[5]. Like the foregoing it is a contemplative meditation ; but it is perfect on account of all that gives it a greater likeness to the first form of contemplation[6].

Contemplation is but one of the perfect acts[7] that the gifts produce in souls. It is one of the most exalted, being an intense employment of charity. But all the moral activity of perfect souls who enjoy *(frtiuntur)* God through charity[8], may be thus transfigured and take on a " delectable " character, even should it be arduous in itself. These diverse acts, which, in other respects, are truly proper to man[9], may from this latter viewpoint, be rightfully attributed to the Holy Ghost, under the name of FRUITS [10]. Of these, some possess a particular objective perfection seeming to call for a more marked intervention of the gifts. In consequence St. Thomas when systematising St. Augustine's teaching associates them very closely with the gifts. These are the BEATITUDES ", seven in number [12] like the gifts to which they

discursive operation, and not an ascension to God). The *oblique movement* is *mixed* for if there are two distinct *termini* it is possible to return from one plane to the plane from which the first oblique movement began, by means of another oblique that immediately follows it, and thus the movement can continue without interruption as in the first case. — It should be evident that St. Thomas considered all these comparisons and graphical representations as purely accessory. What must be retained are the three notions of perfect, imperfect and mixed. See *Sum. th.,* IP-II®, q. 180, a. 4.

[1] It may however be much superior to other forms of meditation.

[2] Ad vitam contemplativam pertinet... secundario vel dispositive. *Sum. th.,* IIMI®, q. 1S0, a. 4. —[3] See above p. 453. Cf. St. Bonaventure, p. 522 sq.

[4] *Compositum,* says St. Thomas, in his comparison with movement: the oblique is "ex recto et circulari compositum ". *Ibid.,* a. 6, ad 2 (end).

[5] *Ibid.* — [6] See above, p. 363 and vol. 1, p. 26-27.

[7] Here is meant especially the first and third forms. The third may be only remotely associated with them. — [8] See *Ascetie Theology.*

[9] Hence their place in ascetic theology; see p. 620.

[10] *Sum. th.,* IMI®, q. 70, a. I. Sunt enim fructus quæcumque virtuosa opera in quibus homo delectatur. *Ibid.,* a. 2.

" Beatitudines dicuntur solum perfecta opera quæ etiam ratione suæ perfectionis magis attribuuntur donis quam virtutibus. *Ibid.,* a. 2, and q. 69, a. 1-4.

[12] *Ibid.*, q. 69. a. 3.

correspond : to the gift of understanding corresponds *purity* (lIMIæ, q. 8, a. 7), to knowledge, *tears* (q. 9, a. 4), to fear, *poverty* (q. 19, a. 12) to wisdom, *peace* (q. 45, a. 6), to counsel, *mercy* (q. 52, a. 4), to piety, *mildness* (q. 121, a. 2), and to fortitude, the *thirst after justice* (q. 139, a. 2). In the accomplishment of these acts the Christian life rises to its highest point and the essential mystical gifts reach their perfection.

The extraordinary gifts mentioned by St. Thomas are *prophecy*, of which he treats at length with reference to the Scriptures[1], *ecstasy (raptus)* mainly *à propos* St. Paul[2] and the graces *gratis data* or *charismata* mentioned by St. Paul[3]. St. Thomas having already clearly distinguished them from sanctifying grace and classified them in various groups[4], now treats especially the *charisma* of tongues[5] and those of wisdom and knowledge[6]. Although not found so frequently as in the first days of the Church, these gifts have not completely disappeared.

VII. ASCETIC THEOLOGY.

I. Ascetic Theology is that part of moral theology[7] in which the means for gradually acquiring perfection are more particularly studied[7]. Charity is the measure of Christian perfection : other virtues are of course necessary for its attainment but unlike charity which directly unites souls to God, they do not constitute it[8].* Charity is the noblestand the most powerful of all virtues[9]; without charitv there can be no true virtue ,[o] and he who has the virtue of charity[7] possesses all the others[11]. The study[7] of moral theology[7] should evidently[7] turn therefore on the gradual formation of charity. A great many[7] theoretical and methodical advantages may accrue from the classification of objects according to the seven virtues : from a practical viewpoint however it is far better to associate all the other virtues directly with charity[7] [12]. Nor does the practical importance thus ascribed to charity[7] imply[7] any[7] voluntarism; since our knowledge of God in our present state is imperfect,

* *Ibid.,* lla-llæ, q. 171-174. — [2] */bid.,* q. 175.
[3] *1 Cor.,* XU, mainly S-io. —[4] */bid.,* i"-næ, q. in, a. 1, 4, 5.
[5] *Ibid.,* lIMIæ, q. Í76. —[6] *ibid.,* q. 177.
[7] See *Introduction,* vol. I, p. 19.
[8] *Sum. lb.,* iP-næ, q. 184, a. I, 2.
[9] *Ibid.,* i'-næ, q. 66. a. 6; IIa-II», q. 23, a. 6; q. 30, a. 4, etc.
[10] *Ibid.,* la-IIæ, q. 65, a. 2, 4; IIa-11«, q. 23, a. 7.
[11] *Ibid.,* Ia-llæ, q. 65, a. 5.
[12] Hence the distinction already mentioned between moral and ascetic theology.

it necessarily gives way to love : " Melior est amor Dei quam cognitio " [1].

St. Thomas distinguishes three degrees in charity, as in the Christian life[3], based on the predominant and successive actions or inclinations *(studia)* that are found in the advance towards perfect union with God. During the natural growth of man it is possible to distinguish different ages; similarly "there exist various degrees of charity according to the diverse obligations *(studia)* that the progress of charily imposes on man. — The *first duty* that falls to him is lhe avoidance of sin, and resistance to the charms of concupiscence which turn him away from charity: this is lhe degree of BEGINNERS in whom charity must be nursed and carefully tended, lest it be lost. Then follows a *second duty :* here man must endeavour above all to grow in goodness, and this is propel-lo THOSE who advance *(Proficientes)* and labour to strengthen and increase the charity that is in them[3]. — The *third duty* of man consists in applying all his efforts to union with God and delight in Him : this is the privilege of the PERFECT who desire *to be dissolved and to be with Christ.* Phil., I, 23 "[4].*

2. Since the Christian's primary obligation is to avoid sin, his first effort must be to resist vice. By uprooting the latter he will ensure the former. This is shewn by St. Thomas in the close connection he makes between them in his explanation[5]. The vices rather than the passions[6][7]are in question here, for the *passions,* provided they are moderated and guided, are forces for good[7], though if given full rein, the may easily become the handmaids of vice. The name of *vices* is given to tendencies whose object is evil[8].* Vices are of many different kinds. St. Thomas enumerates them by opposition to the virtues[9], stressing particularly the *capital vices,* source of all sin[10], especially pride, greed, and lust

In order to complete the rout of vicious habits, the Christian who is desirious of perfection, must not delay in fighting them with the contrary habits, the virtues. First,

[1] *Ibid.,* Ia, q. S2, a. 3; 11a-ll®, q. 23, a. 6; q. 27, a. 4. See R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Perf. chrit. et cont.,* I, p. 164-170. — [2] *Sum. th.,* ii"-ii®, q. 24, a. 9.

[3] Throughout q. 24 it is explained that supernatural charily can be increased only through divine action in the soul *(per infusionem Spiritus Sancti,* a. 2), but the acts of charity that man performs in a state of grace constitute an efficacious disposition.

[4] *Incipientes, proficientes* and *perjecti* are thus the three terms that designate Christians in the three stages of progress in holiness.

[5] See above, p. 562 and p. 603. — [6] *Sum. th.,* na-ii®, q. 24. See above, p. 600.

[7] *Ibid.,* a. 3, ad I. — [8] *Ibid.,* IIa-II®, q. 127, a. I, ad 3.

[9] See analysis of the 11a-n®, p. 562-565. —[10] See above, p. 603.

[11] Hence the importance of the three vows of religion which combat them. See below, p. 621.

the moral virtues that directly attack them [*] and, before all, temperance and fortitude which moderate the concupiscible and irascible appetites. They appease those passions that endanger more particularly the spiritual life, and by strengthening the soul, enable it to fulfil the obligations that are imposed on it by justice and charity, for to the negative duty of avoiding those sins that are fostered by disordered passions is added the obligation of performing acts of positive virtue, especially to others. At the same time the moral virtues aided by the gifts, purify the heart by freeing it of unruly affections and thus disposing it to see God [2],*especially as *prudence,* which in practice is the guide of the Christian life, draws its inspiration from faith, one of whose effects is purity of heart [3]. St. Thomas contrasting the Christian moral virtues with the simple natural virtues, calls them *virtutes purgatories,* becoming in the saints, even in this life but especially in heaven, *virtutes purgati animi.* They always remain, however, inferior to the divine perfections which form their sublime exemplar [4].

The moral virtues pave the way for the full bloom of the theological virtues, the specifically Christian virtues. From another angle, however, the former depend closely' on the latter. First, the infused habitus, which according to St.Thomas, accompany' the cardinal virtues[5]. form as it were an extension of grace and the theological virtues. The latter, on the other hand, provide the Christian with various supernatural *motives* and *energies.* They manifest in man a close and entire dependence on the divine action. Hence the necessity of *grace,* the *sacraments,* devotion *to Christ* [6] and in general *prayer* in all its forms [7], either the prayer of petition or that higher laudatory or contemplative prayer, the spontaneous fruit of a fully developed charity [8].

3. The perfect life is indeed, according to St. Thomas, characterised by *unitive charity* [9], accompanied by wisdom;

[']Cuncta vitia non exhauriuntur nisi per actus virtutum moralium. *Sum. th.,* n»-itæ, q. 1S1, a. i. — [a] */bid.,* q. S, a. 7. — [*] *Ibid.,* q. 7, a. 2.

[i] *Sum. th.,* ia-næ, q. 61, a. 5. —[5] See above, p. 602.

[']On *devotion* in general, see q. 82. (Cf. above, p. 563). The human nature of Christ is peculiarly calculated to excite it, although the object *in se* of devotion, is the Godhead. *Ibid.,* q. 82, a. 3, ad 2.

[l] *Sum. th.,* liMiæ, q. 83, a. 1-17. —[8] *Ibid.,* q. 180, a. 3-5.

[']"Tertium autem studium est ut homo ad hoc principaliter intendat ut *Dco inhareat el eo fmattir:* et hoc perlinet ad perfectos [*]. *Ibid.,* q. 24, a. 9.

its perfect act is *contemplation* [1]. This act is found in three very unequal forms of perfection : in the first the mind rises from the sensible to the spiritual by the operation of the mind alone; in the second this movement is aided by divine enlightenment; in the third the latter stays the working of the mind and concentrates it on God alone [2]. Such is the essential element of the *contemplative life*. The moral virtues, of course, have their use, but mainly as dispositive factors [3]. Moreover, the Holy Ghost Who is active in the perfect during the time of prayer, also acts on them in a more constant way than others, for the perfect practice of the virtues disposes the soul to the *exercise of the gifts* that correspond to them [4]. But this greater degree of receptivity to the divine activity [5] does not overrule all human action. It raises it above itself, even to higher and heroic acts, termed *beatitudes* [6]. All virtuous acts, however, by means of a special co-operation of the Holy Ghost, may be accompanied by spiritual delectation, and are then called the *fruits of the Holy Ghost* [7]. St. Paul enumerates twelve fruits [8] comprising all the acts inspired by the virtues and the gifts. This number could be augmented, but also decreased by reducing it to three alone: charity, joy and peace [9]. These fruits of the Holy Ghost are especially opposed to the desires of the flesh [10].

The activity best adapted to the contemplative life is preaching and the teaching of theology [6]. But all the acts of men that depend on the moral virtues also come under this head, if their ultimate end in practice is to dispose the soul to the enjoyment of the possession of God, rather than

[1] *Ibid.*, q. 45, a. i-6 ; q. 180, a. I : " Quia unusquisque delectatur cum adeptus fuerit id quod amat, ideo vita contemplativa terminatur ad delectationem quæ est in affectu, ex quo etiam amor intenditur [2]. Cf. *Ibid.*, art. 7.

[2] *Ibid.*, q. 180, a. 6. See above, p. 615.

[3] *Ibid.*, q. 180, a. 2; q. i8i, a. I ad 3.

[4] See above, p. 612-614.

[5] The gifts of themselves dispose the soul for reception, putting it into a certain state of passivity. See above, p. 612.

[6] *Sum. th.*, ia-il , q. 69. See above, p. 616.

[7] *Ibtd.*, q. 70, " Opera igitur nostra in quantum sunt effectus quidam Spiritus Sancti in nobis operantis habent rationem fructus " ; art. I, ad I. Cf. a. 2.

[8] *Ibid.*, a. 3. —[9] *Ibid.*, a. 3. — [10] *Ibid.*, a. 4.

" Provided that study tends to spiritual delectation. *Ibid.*, q. 181, a. 3. " Ad contemplativam autem (vitam pertinet) quando homo interius concipit aliquam veritatem intelligibilem, in cujus consideratione et amore delectatur" *Ibid.*

the attainment of their immediate effects [*]. The *active life* in the true meaning of the word is that which is not directly turned in practice to contemplation, either because the agent is not yet sufficiently purified by the virtues, or because he allows himself to be absorbed in the exterior occupations with which he busies himself[2]. In this case the active life is *in se* inferior to the contemplative life, though it may prepare the way thereto [3].

Ascetic theology concerns all Christians, but especially religious, whose state demands that they *should tend* to perfect charity: in this sense the religious life is a state *of* perfection [4]. The special means of which it makes use, poverty, chastity and obedience [5], the objects of vows[6], are exactly adapted to the goal of the religious life. All three entail the practice of charity, a principle of spiritual peace and a pure holocaust[7]. They are opposed to the threefold concupiscence, which, according to St. John (*I Joan.*, II, 16)[8], is the mark of the world. St. Thomas holds that religious may follow either an active or a contemplative life[9], and even justifies the existence of military Orders [*0]. He is in favour of study in the monasteries [11] and places in the first rank those Orders that occupy themselves with preaching and teaching. By so doing they combine the active with the contemplative life and fulful their mission more worthily,[a]. The contemplative Orders lake precedence over those active Orders which busy themselves exclusively with exterior works [13].

VIII. THE REDEEMER AND HIS WORK.

A) The Incarnation.

The Incarnation was the subject of long controversies in the time of the Fathers, who, the better to refute the heresies, made a deep study of dogma. It should be remembered however, that their speculation was of a dogmatic rather than theological nature: their chief care was to safeguard the faith and not to build up its metaphysical explanation. " Leontius of Byzantium and later theologians barely sketched in a theory'[4]... Though the Fathers proclaim that human (nature) cannot be inexistent ἀνυπό-

[1] *Ibid.*, <\. iSo, a. 2;q. i8i,a. 4;q. iS2,a. 3. " Qui (actus exteriores) si referantur ad quietem contemplationis jam pertinent ad vitam contemplativam (Q. iSi, a. 4).
[2] *Ibid.*, q. 179, a. 1-2; q. 1S0, a. 2; q. 1S1, a. I-4; q. 182, a. 1-4.
[3] *Ibid.*, q. 182, a. I and 4.
[4] *Ibid.*, q. 184, a. 5. The obligation is contracted with a certain degree of solemnity. —[5] *Ibid.*, q. 186, a. 3, 4, 5. —[6] *Ibid.*, a. 6. [7] *Ibid.*, a. 7·
[8] *Ibid.*, l'-llæ, q. 108, a. 4. — [*] *Ibid.*, q. 1S8, a. 2. —[10] *Ibid.*, a. 3.
[11] *Ibid.*, art. 4» 5· — [*] *Hdd.*, a. 7·
[«3] *Ibid.*, a. 6. Cf. *ibid.*, q. iS 1-182. —[14] See above, p. 75 sq.

στατο , in Jesus Christ it does not follow that it must exist by its own existence. The conception of Ανυπόστατο leaves the scholastic question intact" C The latter concerns all the aspects of the Incarnation but more particularly the hypostatic union: " It was on this matter of the union that the theological growth of the Christological problem was more particularly evident. In Catholic theology the problem presents itself with a twofold aspect. The theologians... again attacked the problem at the point where it had been leit by the Greek theology of Leontius and Damascene in order to go more deeply into this long controverted question: *why* is not human nature in Christ a person?[2] Secondly, the theologians endeavoured to underline the precise characteristics of the close and substantial union of the two natures in Jesus Christ, and thus brought to the forefront problems that the theology of the Fathers had but touched upon in passing "[3]. St. Thomas succeeded in solving both these problems with especial exactitude [4].

I. Since the xmth century, the first point, the formal constitutive element of the hypostatic union " appears to have centred in itself all the properly scholastic part of the treatise of the Incarnation " and to have become the main object of " theological progress " [5]. A great deal of this development is due to St. Thomas. His teaching in this matter is based on two essential metaphysical principles: the unity of substantial form and the distinction of essence and existence.

The Christology of St. Thomas is partly built up by means of a comparison between the human compound and the theandric compound [6].

1 A. Michel, *Hypostalique (Union),* in *Dici, théol.,* col. 528. Cf. *ibid.,* col. 407 *(Hypostase).*

- " In consequence, they sought to determine the formal and constitutive clement of hypostatic unity in Christ". *Ibid.,* col. 525.

3 *Ibid.,* col. 525.

4 See the works *(Biblio°.,* num. 8), by Terrien, Villard, Schwalm, Hugon.

s A. Michel, *Ibid.,* 525.

6 *Sum. th.,* Ill·, q. 2, a. 6, ad 2. Cf. Quæst. disp. *De unione Verbi inc.,* art. 4; *quodl.* IX, q. 2, a. 2. " We know that St. Thomas, the better to explore in the measure that is possible to our minds the mystery of the Man-God, usually had recourse to analogies. Of these analogies, we repeat, the least imperfect, and the most frequent in Thomist writings, is undoubtedly the analog)' of the human compound'. A. d'Alès, *Thomisme,* in *Did. apol.,* col. 1700. This article concludes with a long and very thought-provoking ""excursus" on Thomist Christology: col. 1697-1713.

It has already been said that for St. Thomas the human compound is essentially constituted by a single substantial form. The Augustinians admitted several forms because they stressed above all the *dynamic* quality of the soul : together with the Platonists they liked to consider the latter as a motor of the body[1], but in so doing they laid themselves open to the risk of loosening its connection with the body, for the union of a motor to what is moved is purely accidental. St. Thomas as a convinced Peripatetic concentrates mainly on the *ontological* aspect: he considers the spiritual soul as the single principle of life (even vegetative and sensitive) in man, principle of substance and being, and also of unity, so that in the being composed of matter and spirit there is but one complete nature, a single individual and concrete substance[2].

Such, with every allowance, is the union of the human and divine nature in Christ, though it should not be forgotten that since the two elements of the compound are here complete natures, the union cannot give rise to a new nature[3]; it nevertheless remains real and substantial[4] by means of the unity of its substantial being which is no other than that of the Word[5]. As the soul is to the body in the human compound so is the being of the Word to the human nature of Christ. The personal being of the Word, which differs only virtually from the dix ine being considered in its absolute nature, supports the human nature that it assumed : it accomplishes in the latter all that its own being would have done, had it not been thus profoundly penetrated by the very power of God. Further, this single personal being may ally itself with diverse virtualities, and St. Thomas in consequence speaks without contradiction of being when referring to the nature, not because there are several beings, but because the same being fulfils more than one function[6].

This first point enables us to solve the great metaphysical problem inherent in the Incarnation: why has the complete nature no personality in Christ? Because, replies St. Thomas, it does not possess its own existence, it exists only in another and by another.

Personality or subsistence (in the formal or abstract sense) is that which gives to the complete substance the capacity of existing by itself and in itself as a distinct whole". It forms the supreme perfection

1 Qu. disp. *De spititualibus creatileis,* a. 3. — 3 *Ibid.*

3 Such would be Monophysitism. —4 Nestorianism is thus avoided.

5 *In III Sent.,* I), VI, q. 2, a. 2; *Quodl.,* IX, a. 9; *De unione Il. inc.,* a. 4; *Sum. th.,* HI, q. 17, a. 2; *Comp. th.,* c. 212.

6 The same substantial and personal being of the suppositum *(ens quod)* may be called *principle* inasmuch as it shows a relation to the divine and eternal nature *(esse quo)* and *secondary* inasmuch as it marks a relation to the human nature *(esse quo)* assumed in the Incarnation and which in no way augments it *(nee in aliquo persona est augmentala).* See *De unione Verbi inc.,* a. 4. Cf. P. Synave, in *Bull, thorn.,* 1926, January, p. [I-21]; concerning F. Printer's article, *La Qu. disp. " De Un. V. inc. "*, in *Arch, de Phil.,* 1925, p. 198-245. These expressions do not prove that St. Thomas changed his opinion on the unity of the substantial being in Christ — even should the *De Unione* date from the end of his life, as Pelster holds.

7 Distinctum subsistens. See above, p. 591.

of the essence as such in the order of being, and not of the essence considered as nature in the order of operation. Its extrinsic principle consists in the possession of its own existence, which in practice makes it incommunicable, so that it suffices that the complete substance should exist, in order to have subsistence (or personality, if it is endowed with reason). The essence *is* itself a person, if it has its *own* existence'; but if the latter is supplied by the existence (esse) of a superior being the essence, even though complete, is deprived of personality, since it is absorbed in the personality of Him who gives it being and life[*]. Such is the case for Christ's human nature : it is not a person because it exists and subsists only by means of the being of the Incarnate Word. This explanation of the personal unity of Christ and this conception of subsistence (or personality) are ultimately based on the real distinction of essence and existence in created being[3]. Later theologians who reject this thesis, were unable to conceive, as St. Thomas does, the hypostatic union as a simple "*substitution* of human existence by the very existence of God"[4]; they explain it by means of an addition (Scotus, Tiphanus) or a modality (Suarez)[5]. In addition, it should be observed that for St. Thomas, as for the Fathers, in the expression *union according to the hypostasis* or *subsistence* (καθ' υπόσταση) subsistence does not signify an abstract modality so much as the concrete subsistent being, i. e., existing in itself and by itself, the unique personal being of the Incarnate Word[6].

2. The characteristics of the hypostatic union have been exactly and clearly specified by St. Thomas[7]. I. It is *immediate :* The Angelic Doctor refutes the opinion of those who admit a kind of intermediary, a natural substantial bond lying between the divine and human natures, and thus by anticipation, he excludes the modality conceived by Scotus and Suarez[8].— 2. It is the *closest* possible *union,* not in respect of the two terms that are infinitely distant, but with regard to the person in which the union takes place : from this

[*] (Essentia) secundum quod per se existit et *non in alio,* vocatur *subsistentia,* illa enim subsistere dicimus quæ *non in alio* sed *in se* existunt. *Sum. th.,* II, q. 29, a. 2. Cf. q. 30, a. 4. See A. Michel, *Hypostase,* in *Diet. th.,* col. 424-429.

3 Illud quod advenit post esse completum, accidentaliter advenit, nisi trahatur in communionem illius esse completi. *Sum. th.,* in», q. 2, a. 6, ad 2.

3 Certain texts, apparently straightforward, have led several modern theologians to say that St. Thomas identified personality with existence. His idea would appear more subtle. For him subsistence lies more on the side of essence than of existence (esse non est de ratione suppositi, *quodl.,* II, a. 4 ad 2), though, as Capreolus says, it is based on existence *{In III Sent.,* D. V, q. 3, a. 3). Cajetanus throws doubt on the latter point : he rightly conceives personality as a substantial modality, but desires it to be independent of existence. See below, p. 742. —4 A. Michel, *Hypostatique (Union), ibid.,* col. 527.

5 See below, p. 657 and p. 784.

6 A. Michel, *Ibid.,* col. 529. —*1 Ibid.,* col. 529-541.

8 In HI Sent., Dist. II, q. 2. a. I (q. Ill) ; *ibid.,* q. 3 ad 3. *Sum. th.,* Ill', q. 2, art. IO; q. 6, a. 6. *De Veril.,* q. xxix, a. 2.

ontological viewpoint it transcends the union of the substance and the accidents, matter and form, the soul and the body [1]. — 3. It is entirely supernatural and yet remains *natural* to Christ's human nature, because the latter was united to the person of the Word from the moment of conception[2]: this was denied by the Adoptionists. — 4. Lastly, it is an *indissoluble* union, according to the principle "What the grace of God grants to us is never withdrawn except through our own fault" [3]. In consequence, St. Thomas with St. John Damascene, in opposition to several of the Fathers, maintains the permanence of the hypostatic union relative to the body separated from the soul, during the three days that elapsed between the death and resurrection of Our Lord.

B). The Redemption.

St. Thomas subordinates the Incarnation to the Redemption not only in the sense that the Word did in fact become flesh in order to redeem man, but also because the Incarnation would not have taken place had man not sinned [4]. Sin is not the cause but the occasion of the Incarnation and that is not contrary to reason [5]. Furthermore, Christ retains His universal primacy: He is the cause of our predestination which is modelled on His own[6]; He is the head of the Church, angels and men[7]; the entire supernatural[8] and natural[9] world is directed to Christ. Thus even in Thomist teaching, the Incarnate Redeemer still remains the exemplary, efficient and final cause of our predestination [10].

St. Thomas admits furthermore the relative necessity of the Incarnation *for the redemption of the human race* in the particular hypothesis [11] that God demanded an equivalent ransom [12]. This teaching implies not only that man having sinned and being reduced to his natural impotency was

1 *Sum. th.*, in·, q. 2, a. 9.
3 *Ibid.*, q. 2, a. 12; q. 33, a. 3. — 3 *Ibid.*, q. 50, a. 2.
4 Opinion given as probable in *In III Sent.*, D. I, and as more probable in *Sum. th.*, IIIa, q. 1, a. 3.
5 *Ibid.*, a. 3, ad 3. — 6 *Ibid.*, q. 23, a. 3-4.
7 *Ibid.*, q. 8, a. 1-6. *De Verit.*, q. 29, a. 7.
8 *Contra Gentes*, IV, c. 27. — 9 *Sum. th.*, IIIa, q. 23, a. 3-4.
10 For the answer to Scotist objections, see A. Michel, *Incarnation*, in *Did. th.*, col. 1502-1506.
11 God could have used other means. *Sum. th.*, IIIa, q. I, a. 2.
13 *Ibid.*, a. 2, ad 2.

incapable of providing this ransom, which all concede (even Scotists), but also that no creature could be so endowed with grace as to be capable of offering this equivalent satisfaction. St. Thomas gives a number of reasons for this, particularly the relative infinity of the offence against God and the infinity of the good destroyed by sin [1].

St. Thomas did not systematise the doctrine of the Redemption in a separate treatise as is usual in our time. This was because he already had the Redeemer in mind even in that part of his work dealing with the *person of Christ.* This is evident in the very first question concerning the reasons for the Incarnation, and in that which treats of Christ as head of the Church (q. Vili) and still more so in the last questions of the treatise, especially those that deal with the priesthood and mediation of the Saviour[2], His obedience, His prayer and His adoration [3]. St. Thomas treats explicitly of the Redemption in the second part, while writing of the *life of Christ,* which he treats as a theologian rather than as an historian. He explains his soteriological teaching more particularly when on the subject of the Passion.

The essentials of this teaching are to be found condensed in the questions devoted to the effects of the Passion[4] and the author sums them up in these terms[5]: "Compared with His divinity, the Passion of Christ acts in an *efficacious* way (as instrumental cause) [6]; compared with the will of Christ, it acts in a *meritorious* way[7]; considered in His Body it acts by way of *satisfaction*[8], inasmuch as it delivers us from punishment; by way of *redemption*[9], inasmuch as it delivers us from guilt, and lastly by way of *sacrifice* inasmuch as it reconciles us with God" [10]. Christ offers to God not only an equivalent but a *superabundant* sacrifice" [11]: because of His love, His dignity and the greatness of His sufferings, what He offered to God was loved in a greater measure than

[1] *Contra Gentes,* IV; 54; *De Verit.,* q. 28, a. 2; *Sum. th.,* IIIa, q. I, a. 2; *Comp, th., c.* 199-200. Duns Scotus (see below, p. 657) criticises all these arguments and defends the contrary thesis. St. Thomas and his followers differ as regards the nature of the infinity of the offence against God.

[2] *Sum. th.,* ill*, q. 22 and 26. — [3] *Ibid.,* q. 20, 21 and 25.

[4] *Ibid.,* q. 48-49. — [5] *Ibid.,* q. 48, a. 6 ad 3. — [6] *Ibid.,* a. 6.

[7] *Ibid.,* a. I. — [8] *Ibid.,* a. 2. — [9] *Ibid.,* a. 4. — [10] *Ibid.,* a. 3.

[11] *Ibid.,* q. 48, a. 2. " Ideo passio Christi non solum sufficiens, sed etiam *superabundan!* satisfactio fuit pro peccatis humani generis ". — Thomists have been loyal to their master in maintaining that the satisfaction was equivalent *ex se* and not only *ex acceptatione divina,* as Scotists teach, whose opinion was thus judged by Suarez "nec probabilis, nec pia, nec fidei satis consentanea". Cf. p. 657. The Thomist interpretation of St. Thomas also sees in the satisfaction of Christ a certain infinity and a definite value in strict justice: all this was denied by Scotus.

sin was hated*. St. Thomas insisted on the enormity of the sufferings of Christ, but stressed still more the moral qualities of His sacrifice; *liberty, loue* and *obedience.* In these, more than in His suffering, is seen the essence of His satisfaction 1*. Christ has delivered us from sin 1 and from the devil (who, however, had no strict rights over us, but only a certain power *defacto*4,5; He has reconciled us with God and opened to us the way to heaven s. He alone is the Redeemer6, the Redeemer of all (universalis omnium Salvator)7, in Whom all men, even Our Lady, are made holy.

C) The Virgin Mary8.* The Mediatrix.

His desire to maintain the universality of the Redemption led St. Thomas like most of his contemporaries, to admit that, *de facto,* Our Lady was subject to original sin, but that she was purified before her birth 9, very soon after *(cito post)* her conception and the infusion of her soul IoII

In reality St. Thomas did not rise to the conception of a redemption which not only effaces a stain contracted *de Jacto,* but consists in *preservation* from a culpability to which our Lady was subject only *dejure.* Light on this point did not come until a later date. Nevertheless, the Angelic Doctor explained his ideas by means of profound congruent arguments which can easily be adapted to the Immaculate Conception and the exemption from the *fomes peccati* (concupiscence) now that these dogmas are admitted "The sanctification that was bestowed on the Blessed Virgin does not consist in a purification, but in a real preservation from original sin. When this dogmatic base is allowed, St. Thomas' arguments in article I retain all their value"'3. Those regarding concupiscence in article 3 should be taken to mean total exemption.

On the other points St. Thomas' marial theology is perfect^. He explains that Mary is *full of grace* because she was nearer than anyone else to the person of Christ, the principle of grace (His divinity is the source, and His

'On the principle: " Ille proprie satisfacit pro offensa qui exhibet offenso id quod æque vel magis diligit quam oderit offensam *Ibid.,* q. 48, a. 2.

I Ibid., a. 2. — 3 *Ibid.,* q. 49, a. I.

4 Ibid., a. 2. See especially q. 48, a. 4, ad 2, 3. Cf. J. Rivière, *Le dogme dt la Rédemption,* p. 478-480. St. Thomas mentions the theory of the devil's misuse of power : ""Excessit modum potestatis sibi tradita; a Deo". *Sum. ih.,* IIP, q. 49, a. 2.

5 Ibid., a. 4-5. — 6 *Ibid.,* 48, a. 5. — 7 *Ibtd.,* q. 27, a. 2, ad 2.

8SeeP. Synave, O. P., *Vie de ¡Jesus,* i, p. 282-289.

9 Sum. th., IIIa, q. 27, a. 1-2. *Comp, th., c.* 224. *In III Sent.,* D. m, q. i, a. I, q. 1-2.

w Quodl., vi, q. 5, a. I. St. Thomas means posterior in time and not in nature, as has been claimed.

II P. Synave, *op. cit.,* p. 288-289.

" Ibid., p. 13.

Sum. th., ma, q. 27-30. Opuse, on the *Ave ¡Wana.*

humanity the channel); furthermore, her privilege as *Mother of God* demanded this fulness \ — She is *our mother* in the spiritual order, mother of divine grace, both in the sense that *she aided* in the work of Redemption and it is she *who distributes* grace : she it is who, in a certain manner, — *aliquomodo* — as a cause subordinated to Christ, pours forth grace on the whole of mankind. " In the strictest meaning of the term she is the Mediatrix " 2.

D) The Sacraments. The Church.

I. The sacraments are the means by which the Redemption is applied to us. St. Thomas' sacramentary teaching finally fixed the main outlines of the theological systematisation that was built up concerning this subject during the Middle Ages. To St. Thomas are due a number of interesting points of detail regarding the *efficacy* of the sacraments, the theory of their *matter andforni,* and their *raison d'etre.*

According to St. Thomas the sacraments are above all signs3, but efficacious signs: *efficiunt quod figurant*4. He uses the expression ex *opere operato,* that had been known since the xilth century5 and applied to the sacraments of the New Law in contrast to the *ex opere operantis* of the sacraments of the Old Law 6. He teachs that the sacraments of the New Testament possess a true efficient causality7, not as principal but as *instiumental causes*3. By this clear declaration St. Thomas rejects that simple *occasional* causality proposed by various medieval authors9. Such, of course, is not a true causality. At the outset, St. Thomas himself adopted the theory of *dispositive* causality: the sacrament produces by its instrumental power a disposition that calls for grace, which is then given through a direct action of God10. It is produced by that "spiritual and instrumental quality" to which the Summa also attributes the production of grace : the latter is then, in its turn, immediately attained by the power of the sacrament. St. Thomas opinions therefore underwent great changes in this matter ".

* P. Synave, *op. cit.,* p. 289-291.

3 *Ibid.,* p. 299-302. Cf. *Sum. th.,* IIIa, q. 30, a. I ; *In Joan.,* il, lect. I, n. 3 (mediation in events). — See also R. Bernard, *Mater divince gratia* in *Rev. sc. phil. th.,* 1927, p. 405-424.

3 *Sum. th.,* IIIa, q. 60, a. I-2. — 4 *Ibid.,* q. 62, a. I.

5 Found in Peter of Poitiers. St. Thomas says : *opus operatum* and *opus operans.*

6 *In IVSent.,* D. I, q. I, a. 5. *Sum. th.,* Ia-IIæ, q. 103, a. 3 ; IIIa, q. 62, a. 6.

7 *Sum. th.,* IIIa, q. 62, a. 1-5. — H *Ibid.,* a. I, 4.

9 Attributed, on disputable grounds, to St. Bonaventure and Duns Scotus. Cf. Pourrat, *La thiol, sacram.,* p. 151-153.

10 *In IVSent.,* D. I, q. I, a. 4. This disposition that "calls for grace", is the character (in those sacraments that possess one) or "a certain ornament of the soul ". This (physical) dispositive causality was defended by early Thomists (La Palu, Capreolus...) until Cajetan. Billot renewed it in late years.

11 *Sum. th.,* IIIa, q. 62 a. 4.

It may be wondered, however, whether he rejected his former theory of dispositive causality when he adopted that of *-perfective causality.* Cajetan thought that he did, and since that time most Thomists attribute to the sacrament both the immediate production of grace and character (when one exists)[1]. Since the xvith century moreover, theologians, reacting against Melchior Cano's theory of *moral causality**, have stressed the *physical* quality of the action of the sacraments : the term only is new, since St. Thomas, though he does not speak of physical causality, affirms its *real influence* on grace, even in those texts in which even to the end he underlines the importance of the sign in causality[2]. These texts however have always given rise to lively discussion among theologians.

The application of the theory of matter and form to the sacraments had been suggested by William of Auxerre[4]. This was fully developed in the *Summa theologica.* In question 60[5] St. Thomas states in a general way the analogy existing in the order of signification between the *things* and *words* of the sacrament and the matter and form *of* the body. Treating of each sacrament he employs this now classical terminology. He even used the hylomorphical teaching in his arguments, notably the perfective function of form with regard to matter[6]. These principles were rapidly applied to all the sacraments, taking into account the peculiar nature of each, since some were not so easily adaptable[7]. Thus, unlike Peter Lombard, St. Thomas considers absolution as the essential part (form) of *penance,* but maintains the exterior actions of the penitent[8] as essential elements (matter). In *marriage* the consent of the man and woman alone contains the matter and form[9]. The application of the principle remained supple, in order to safeguard traditional teaching : only in these conditions could it be useful. Among other theological

1 That, however, was not absolutely demanded by the nature of the sacrament nor even perhaps by the texts of St. Thomas. The following passages in the Summa favour dispositive causality : IIIa, q. 63, a. 3 ad 2; a. 4, ad I ; q. 69 a. io; q. 24, a. I, ad 3.

3 Cano considered them as constituting an efficacious appeal to God for grace. They have a true moral instrumental causality because of the merits of Christ which they supplicate.

3 Verba operantur in sacramentis quantum ad sensum quem faciunt. *Sum. th.,* IIIa q. 60, a. 8. Verborum significatio est efficax. *Ibid.,* q. 75, a. 7 ad 3. Cf. *Ibid.,* q. 78, a. 2 ad 2; a. 4 ad 3. St. Thomas himselfs explains instrumental causality by means of the "intentional virtue" of the agent. *De un. V. inc.,* a. 5, ad 12.

4 Also found in the *Summa th.,* of Alexander of Hales.

5 *Sum. th.,* q. 60, a. 6 (ad 2), a. 7, a. 8. Duns Scotus generalised the distinction of remote and proximate matter. *(Of>. Ox.,* D. Ill, q. 3; D. vn, q. 1), made by St. Thomas with regard to penance (q. 84, a. 2.)

6 *Ibid.,* q. 60, a. 7.

7 Durand de Saint-Pourçain refused to admit that all the sacraments were composed of matter and form. *{In IVSent.,* D. I, q. 3.)

8 For Lombard all the sacrament consisted in these; Duns Scotus on the contrary regarded them as simple conditions, though absolutely necessary.

9 *In IVSent.,* D. XXVI, q. 2. This point led to controversy, notably on the part of Melchior Cano who wrongly thought the priest's blessing to be the form of the sacrament. See p. 747.

consequences of sacramentary hylomorphism, should be mentioned liuthei eliminations of deprecative forms in favour of indicative forms (in penance foi instance) or the adoption of complementary rites[1]. The importance of these innovations is undeniable; but they must on no account be regarded as constituting substantial changes in dogma. All that was new was a fresh systematisation of traditional teaching.

St. Thomas had recourse to another analogy, that of natural life, in order to explain the sacramentary doctrine and especially to justify the number of the sacraments. It is necessary for man in the course of his natural life to grow more perfect both in his own person and in relation to society. — *a)* In his own person, man must normally receive life, increase and maintain it, and, if necessary, be cured and strengthened. These same needs exist in the supernatural order and in the Christian are satisfied on the one hand by *baptism, confirmation* and the *Holy Eucharist* and on the other by *penance* and *extreine unction.* — *U)* In his social relationships man is perfected either with regard to public authority or with respect to propagation of the species, and to this twofold end there corresponds in the spiritual order the sacraments of *Holy Orders* and *matrimony* [2]. The theological teaching on each of these sacraments in particular is then explained [3] in detail, either in the light of the general metaphysical principles given above, or by means of special principles of which the more important [4] have just been explained.

2. The Church was not intended to occupy a special place in St. Thomas' synthesis. As traditional teaching in this matter had not then been subjected to explicit denials, theologians had not been led to study it more particularly, as was the case in the xvith and even from the XIVth century [5]. It is by no means lacking in St. Thomas' work however.

Three points are particularly worthy of notice. i. In the treatise on the Incarnation, the Angelic Doctor studies Christ as *Head of the*

1 P. POURRAT, *op. cit.,* p. 71-74. On the institution of the sacraments, see *ibid.,* p. 74-83.

3 *Sum. th.,* IIP, q. 65, a. I.

3 In the *Summa th.,* as far as the middle of penance only.

4 St. Thomas' *Eucharistic teaching,* which was especially clear, thanks to his philosophy, eliminated in advance various theories that were popular after the xvith century. On the question of the Eucharistic Sacrifice according to St. Thomas, see Pègues, *Comment.,* V. XVlii, q. S3, a. 3.

5 See below, p. 676 sq.

Churchl. He remarks above all the fulness of grace that is in Him, and which is precisely what makes Him the head : The Church is *His body and* contains all men in the measure that they receive grace'. 2. In the *doctrinal order* he recognises the full and infallible authority of the Church3; an authority that extends to facts of dogma, as he shews when treating of the canonisation of saints4.* The pope possesses full power and may even determine *(ordinare)* the expressions of the creed as far as is necessary to answer fresh heretical assertions s. 3. The ideas ot St. Thomas on the relations of *Church and State* are first indicated in the classical comparison of the soul and the body : "The secular power is subject to the spiritual as the body is to the soul, as St. Gregory Nazianzen says. *Orat.* xvii " 6. He recognises the power of the Church to annul the authority of princes and excommunicate them 7. Even apart from these exceptional cases he clearly affirms the normal pre-eminence of the Church, on account of the greatness of the end that is proper toit : thus, even the princes must obey the Sovereign pontiff as they would Jesus Christ, whose vicar he is8 9

IX. BEATITUDE.

St. Thomas was unable to treat of the doctrine of *tice last things* as he had intended to do 9 at the end of the *Summa.* He nevertheless furnished various elements of this teaching in the course of his work. Of these we propose to deal here only with those that concern happiness, or more exactly, the essential and constitutive act of beatitude I0.* This is one of the points on which the Angelic Doctor differed from contemporary theologians. The latter attributed almost equal importance to the two great faculties of intelligence and will, and tended to stress that of the will, which finally came to preponderate in the theology of Duns Scotus XI. St. Thomas on the contrary affirms that beatitude consists essentially and perhaps exclusively in an *act of the intelligence,* in that *vision of God* that is so thoroughy treated at the beginning of the *Summa I2.* The

1 *Sum. th.,* IIIa, q. 8, a. 1-6. — 2 *Ibid.,* a. 3. — 3 *Ibid.,* IIa-IIæ, q. 2, a. 6 ad 3. 4 *Quodl.,* IX, a. 16. — 5 *Sum. th.,* IIa-II®, q. I, a. 10.

6Ibid., n. 60, a. 6, ad 3. — 7 *Ibid.,* q. 10, a. 10; q. 12, a. 2.

8 " Hujus regni (Christi) ministerium... sacerdotibus est commissum et præcipue summo sacerdoti successori Petri, Christi vicario, Romano Pontifici, cui omnes reges populi christiani oportet esse subditos, sicut ipsi Domino Jesu Christo. Sic enim ei ad quem finis ultimi cura pertinet subdi debent illi ad quos pertinet cura antecedentium finium et ejus imperio dirigi *De regimine frincipuin,* 1, 14.

9 See IIIa, Prologus.

'° Happiness has been treated above as *foundation* of moral theology. See above, p. 598.

" Sec p. 648. — 12 *Sum. th.,* Ia, q. 12.

act of the will is subsequent The Angelic Doctor however reached this final conclusion only through a process of slow evolution. The stages of his progress are worth follo"ring1.

In his first writings the act of the intelligence plays a large part because in it is found the "substance" of beatitude, but the act of the will is associated with it as its formal and therefore essential complement3. The *Contra Gentes* is more precise but not absolutely satisfying: the essence of beatitude is in intellection more *(magis)* than in the act of the will 4. St. Thomas was well aware that the essence is indivisible but he desired to maintain the traditional parallelism of the two acts, which he knew moreover, to be of unequal importance: that of the intelligence is "principal"5, that of the will "concomitant"6. Similar expressions are to be found in the disputed question of 1266 7. But when we come to the *Summa theologica* we find a true disjunction of the two acts : " It is impossible for the (essence of beatitude) to be in the act of the will... The essence of beatitude consists in the act of the intelligence " 8. To the will belongs only the joy that follows : *consequitur consecutionem finis* 9. In the *Compendium theologice* which dates from the end of his life, St. Thomas retains the same teaching and accentuates still more, if that were possible, the dominant note by calling the beatific vision by a word that he had formerly rejected : " comprehension " ,0.

St. Thomas is the *most outstanding of the theologians* who carried on the work of the Fathers. The rapid doctrinal synthesis we have attempted in the foregoing pages shows how much precision his systematisation added to the writings of early theologians.

As a lover of tradition he was always careful to preserve, together with the explicitly revealed deposit of faith, the gradual enrichment that the later received from the Fathers, St. Augustine in particular.

As an innovator of genius he produced, with the help of his modified Aristotelism, a doctrinal work of unrivalled penetration, lucidity and method.

1 *Sum. th.,* Ia itæ, q. 3, a. 4.

2 See MANDONNET, *La nature ae la béatitude,* p. 497-505, in 5. *Thomas, créateur du quodlibet,* article in the *Rev. sc. ph. th.,* 1926, p. 477-506.

' Delectatio (voluntatis) est quasi *formaliter complens* rationem beatitudine, sicut superveniens visioni, in qua substantia beatitudinis consistit. *In IV Sent.,* D. xi.IX, q. i, a. I, sol. 2. Same expression in *quodl.* vm, a. 19.

4 *Conti a Genies,* ill, c. 26. — 5 *Ibid.,* n. 1. — 6 *Ibid.,* n. 2.

On Realutide : edited by Mandonnet *(Rev. thorn.,* 1918, p. 50-55).

B *Sum. th.,* ι»·π«, q. 3, a. 4. — 9 *Ibid.,* a. 4, ad 3.

10 *Coni[>. th.,* c. 165-166. *Comprehensio* means more than *app/ehensio* and even *visio.* It refers of course, to a relative "comprehension". St. Thomas had rejected the word in the sense of an absolute and adequate " comorehension" *Quodl.,* X, a. 17. Cf. *Sum. th.,* P, q. 12. a. 7. Iria, Io, a. k

As master of Christian thought he is no less original. Unlike the Augustinians who were more interested in kindling the love of God than in a methodical classification of revealed truths, he showed theologians the method they were to follow thereafter; an *intellectual* explanation of sacred doctrine[4] He unreservedly admitted the rights of natural reason, but placed it wholly in the service of the faith.

St. Thomas is thus extremely *modern,* as is also St. Augustine from other points of view[2]. His true sphere is theological teaching; he is pre-eminently the "Master"; he is the Guide of Studies in the words of His Holiness Pius XI[3], the latest echo of that tradition which for centuries has called the Dominican doctor the *Angel of the Schools.*

CHAPTER XI.

Theologians and Thomism in the XIIIth century.

Bibliography: see the notes for each author.

I. THE OPPOSITION TO THOMISM[1]

It was scarcely to be expected that such a teaching as that of St. Thomas, containing so much that was new, even on apparently essential points of theology, should meet with no resistance. Already in 1270 certain secular professors attempted to procure its condemnation together with the works of Siger of Brabant. They succeeded in 1270: of the 219 mainly Averroist propositions[5] condemned

[4] Though not rejecting the theses that form the basis of Augustinism. See p. 335.

[2] See v. I, p. 716.

[3] Encycl. *Studiorum ducem,* June 29th 1923.

[4] P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant,* Freiburg, 1899 (2nd ed., 1908-1911). P. Glorieux, *Les premières polémiques thomistes.* I. *Le Correclorium Corruptorii Quare",* Kain, 1927. Fr. Ehrlb, *Der Augustinismus und Aristotelismus gegen Ende des jj Lahr..,* in *Arch. f. Litteralur u. Á'ircheng.* 1899, p. 603-635; *L'agostinismo e Γaristotelismo nella scol. del s. XIII,* in *Xenia thorn.,* III (1925), p. 517-588. E. Portalié, *Augustinisme,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2506-2514. A. D'alés, *Le thomisme,* in *Diet, ap.,* col. 1675-1680.

[5] Cf. Mandonnet, *Op. cit.,* Text in *Chart, univ. par., I,* 544 sq.

by Stephen Tempier at Paris (March 7th) twenty were Thomist philosophical propositions x. A few days later on March 18th 1277 at Oxford, the Archbishop of Canterbury, *Richard Kilwardby* condemned thirty propositions. Among these were a number of Thomist propositions mainly concerning the unity of forms or more precisely the composition of bodies in general 11. As Kilwardby had not hesitated to condemn one of his brethren, his successor, the Franciscan *John Peckham* thought he could be equally rigorous 3. He himself was an enthusiastic Augustinian in the manner of St. Bonaventure and had already resisted St. Thomas at Paris 4. In 1284 (Oct. 29th) he explicitly confirmed his predecesser's judgment and two years later, on April 30th 1286, he pronounced a new condemnation against eight Thomist propositions, going so far as to regard the thesis of the unity of the substantial form as heretical 5.

These public manifestations were no more than an episode of the doctrinal struggle that was then raging in. the schools between the two Orders... The Franciscans read the works of St. Thomas, but with a jaundiced eye. About 1278 William de la Mare6 drew up his famous catalogue of corrections (*Correclorium,* termed *Corruptorium* by the Dominicans). In the quodlibetic and disputed questions, the *Summa* and the 1st book on the Sentences he pointed out, in as many articles, 118 (or 123) corrections that were necessary7, concerning either the theses themselves or else false, inexact, dangerous and tendentious expressions. The unity of form was a favourite target; but a number of other points were relentlessly criticised and among

1 They concerned the unity of the universe (Prop. 34, 77), individuation by matter (Prop. 27, 81, 96, 97), localisation of separate substances and their relation with the physical world (Prop. 204, 218, 219) the dignity of the human soul and its intellectual activity (Prop. 124, 125), the operation of the will (Prop. 126, 165^ 173)·

3 DeNIFLE, *Chariul.,* I, 558-559. See above p. 487.

3 P. Glorieux, *Comment les thèses thomistes furent proscrites à Oxford,* in *Rev. thom.,* p. 259-291. See above p. 493.

4 Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln in 1285. *Chart, univ. par.,* 1, p. 634.

5 In the letter mentioned in the foregoing note, he violently attacked this doctrine and even more so the general innovations of the Preaching Friars who for twenty years had been introducing novelties into " the high places of theology "; to these philosophers in whom he found more pride than solid worth he compared the sons of St. Francis, Alexander of Hales and St. Bonaventure. " men of sound and healthy doctrine " (solidior et sanior doctrina). The doctrinal position of the Franciscan Order was thus gradually moulded: it took its stand with medieval Augustinism while the Dominicans adopted Thomism.

6 See above, p. 493.

7 These may be found in the refutation edited by P. Glorieux *(op. cit.).* Table in A. d'Ales, *op. cit.,* 1678-1679.

them, the very ones that Peckham chose in his celebrated letter to the Bishop of Lincoln[1]. William's initiative met with great success. The General Chapter of his Order held at Strasburg in 1282 made his Correctorium obligatory for students "notabiliter intelligentes" who were allowed to read the Summa: the antidote had to go with the poison. This work which provoked vigorous parries from the Preachers[2] was not the Franciscans' only offensive weapon. It was echoed in the many *treatises* composed at the same period on "the unity of forms"[3] and in the scholastic exercises *(Questiones disputatee)* which the masters devoted to one or other of the vexed questions[4]. The act of the General Chapter of Strasburg had considerable importance : it caused the Franciscan Order to take up an unequivocal doctrinal attitude: not only did it refuse to follow in the footsteps of St. Thomas but placed itself in direct opposition to his method and philosophy[5]. The principal exponent of Franciscan philosophical tendencies, at the encl of the XIIth century, was *Duns Scotus* who will be studied in the following chapter.

The canonisation of St. Thomas (1323) marked the end of the first great onslaught against his teaching. The act of Stephen Tempier which had spurred on most of his adversaries was withdrawn in 1324 by Tempter's successor, Stephen de Bourret. The Franciscan School kept steadfastly to the path it had chosen. On the other hand, the Dominican School, after some hesitation, took up a clear-cut policy and drew to its ranks many other religious or secular theologians. There were still however a number of independent thinkers, who remained outside the orbit of the schools.

II. THE DOMINICAN ORDER AND THOMISM[6].

I. The Dominican order was not long in speaking out in favour of Thomism. At the outset, no doubt, St. Thomas' new ideas had come as a surprise to many masters trained in other methods. Many did not raise an outcry as did Kilwardby in England ; there was nevertheless a good deal

[1] Quidquid docet Augustinus de regulis æternis et luce incommutabili, de potentiis animæ, de rationibus seminalibus initis materne et consimilibus innumeris destruit pro viribus et enervat (novella doctrina). *Chart, ti. par.,* 1, 634.

[3] See below, p. 636.

[3] P. Glorieux, *op. cit.,* in *Rev. thom.,* 1927, p. 286-287.

[4] See above, p. 358.

[5] P. Mandonnet, *Premiers travaux de polémique thomiste,* in *Rev. se. ph. th.,* 1913, p. 48-70, 245-262; *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Diet, th.,* col. S86-897. M. Grabmann, *De Summer D. Thoma A. theologia studio in 0. Fr. Eradicatorum jeun sac. XIII et XIV vigente,* in *Mise. Dominicana,* Rome, 1923. A. Bacic, *Ex primordiis Schola thomistica,* Rome, 1928.

of ill-feeling in Paris at Saint Jacques, where Albert the Great, then in his eightieth year came to restore the peace. After 1278 the general chapters of the Order enacted increasingly favourable measures: at Milan (1278) a reaction against Kihvardby and his English followers took place; at Paris (1279, I2^6) those who cried down Thomism were reproved and even threatened with deposition if they held official posts; at Saragossa (1309) Thomism was made obligatory for professors and students and it may be said that since that time the teaching of St. Thomas has become the accepted teaching of the Dominican theologians, with very few exceptions.

In addition to these official measures we must mention the activity of St. Thomas' defenders. Their better known works are the famous CORRECTORIA written against the pseudo-correctorium *(corruptorium)* of William de la Mare Four main types of this kind of writing are extant[1]2 the most complete is the *Corrcctorium corruptorii Quare'* dating from 1282-1286, composed in England probably by Richard Clapwell[3]. Shortly afterwards at Paris, John Quidort O. P., master in theology, wrote another, which was never finished[4]. The debated questions were of a philosophical and theological nature : among these latter may be mentioned the theses treating *of* the beatific vision inasmuch as it is immediate and essentially an act of the intelligence, the nature of poverty, and the manner in which it was practised by Christ and the Apostles.—With these specifically apologetical works should be associated the special treatises on certain points of Thomist doctrine, denied by the adversaries of the school. The foremost of these is that of Gilles de Lessines[5] on *the unity*[6] *of form,* aimed at Kilwardby's decrees. This treatise " occupies one of the first places —and perhaps the first—in the mass of literature that was aroused by the controversy on forms at the end of the XI11th century. There were also writings relating to other specially controverted points of Thomist teaching : *De immediata visione Def De differentia esse et essentia, De aternitate mundi, De intellectu et voluntate* "[7].

1 Termed *Quare, Sciendum, Circa, Questioni* according to their initial word.

2 P. Glorieux, *Le Corrcctorium corruptorii Quare,* Kain 1927.

3 *Ibid.,* Introduction; and *Rev. th.,* 1927, n. 2S2-291.

4 M. Grabmann, *Le " Corr, corrupt.' du Dominicain Joannes Quidort de Paris,* in *Rev. néo-scol.,* 1912, p. 404-418. Joannes Quidort *(Dormiens)* was also called *Jean de Pans* (d. 1306). See P.-M. SCHAFF, *Jean Quidort,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 840-841. F. Lajard, in *Hist. litt. de France,* v. xxv, p. 244-266. On his treatise *De potestate regia et papati,* see below, p. 679.

5 friend and former pupil of Albert the Great with whom he corresponded in 1270 and 1277 when opposition to Thomism was rife. Gilles de Lessines wrote several treatises {*De Usuris*—attributed to St. Thomas—Ziel *crepusculis* and *De temporibus*—unedited), in addition to the *De unitateJorma.*

M. de Wulf, *Le traité "De unitate forma" de Gilles de L.,* Louvain, 1901.

7 M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. méà.,* II, p. 43.

The following are the better known of St. Thomas' first disciples, in addition to JOHN QUIDORT, and GILLES DE Lessines.

Bernard de la Treille (1240-1292) a natives of Nîmes, master at St. Jacques in Paris, was one of the first Thomists. He gave particular attention to the real distinction of essence and existence and the theory of knowledge. In addition to his philosophical writings he composed various explanations of the Scriptures.

Ptolemy de Lucca [1] (1245-1327) attended Thomas' lectures at Naples and often heard his confession. He drew up a list cf his works and wrote biographical notes in his *Ecclesiastical History* and *Annals,* composed at the beginning of the XIVth century. He follows Thomist teaching in his philosophical and theological treatise on the Hexaemeron, and it was he who finished the *De regimine principiim.* After having spent several years at the pontifical court of Avignon, Ptolemy became Bishop of Torcello, near Venice (1318).

Hugh de Billon, died Bishop of Ostia in 1298 wrote several defences of Thomist doctrine and probably an interesting *Contra corruptorem Thome* (unedited).

William de Hozun, Archbishop of Dublin, who died in 1297, followed and defended pure Thomism in his numerous writings (unedited).

Various other authors have their place in the history of the following century.

2. The name of Neoplatonists may be given to a fairly considerable group of Dominicans who, without any hostility towards St. Thomas, followed another path, especially in philosophy and preferred the teaching either of ALBERT THE Great, whose works embraced a great variety of matters[2], or William of Mgerbere (d. 1286) "the founder of Neoplatonism in the Xlllth century" [3]. William was a learned Greek scholar, deeply versed in Oriental questions and Archbishop of Corinth from 1278. He introduced many Greek works to the West, including many authors in addition to Aristotle. He translated the *Elementatio theologica* [4] of Proelus in 1268 and three of his opuscula at a later date. He appears to have been deeply interested in Neoplatonism and passed on his enthusiasm to others.

1 Ptolemy (I'tolémée) derives from Tolémé, itself a corruption of Barthélémy (Bartholomew). Cf. P. Mandonnet, *Ecrits aulii.,* p. 55 sq. F. Janssens, *op. cit.,* (above, p. 530).

2 See above, p. 490.

3 M. de Wulf, *Hist, de la ph. mid.,* 11, p. iio-iu. Cf. *ibid.,* 1, p. 229-233.

4 Source of the book *De causis* commented by St. I homas. See above, p, 542. This work by Proclus was itself commented at lhe l>eginning *oí* the XIVth century' by a Dominican, Berthold de Mosburg, probably a disciple of I hierry of Freiburg.

In addition to Albert and William the chief Dominicans who shared these tendencies in the xmth century were :

Hugh Ripelin of Strasburg (d. 1268) author of one of the best medieval theological manuals, the *Compendium theologica veritatis* (written about ‡265)

Ulric of Strasburg (d. 1277)[2] left a great philosophical and theological treatise (unedited), the *Summa de bono,* imitated from the *Liber de causis,* and a number of other Neoplatonist works.

Thierry of Freiburg[3] (in Saxony, hence his name, the Teuton) born about 1250, a professor at Paris about 1297, author of a great number of novel opinions of a scientific, philosophical, and mystical nature. His Platonism was very marked and his spiritual teaching was akin to that of Eckhart.

In addition to these writings of a well-marked doctrinal and speculative bias, there is to be found in contemporary Dominican literature a fairly large number of works which were not influenced by the philosophical schools[4].

Some of the most outstanding of these are *apologetical* writings aimed at the Cathari and the Waldensians (1244) and the Jews *(Pugio fidei,* 1278). Raymond Martin, author of the latter, also composed in 1256-1257, a kind of *catechism* similar to St. Thomas' short oratorical opuscula[5], and also another popular work known in the vernacular as the "Somme le Roi" written in 1277 by a Dominican, confessor to Philip the Bold. The *Summa de Panitentia* of St. Raymond of Pennafort (d. 1275) is a treatise of *practical moral theology* which had a great influence[6]. Later, John of Freiburg (d. 1314) composed in his turn an excellent *Summa confessorum,* while other authors evolved a method for *preaching* or compiled anthologies for preachers[7]. With the same practical purpose, collections of the lives of the saints were written : the most famous of these is the *Legenda Sanctorum* (about 1260) by Jacopo de Voragine[8], which had enormous vogue and came to be called the *Golden Legend.* Finally comes a mass of educational treatises *(De modo docendi Pueros* before 1265), especially regarding the education of princes or the government of states. St. Thomas wrote the *De regno,* but the *De eruditione firincipum,* wrongly attributed to him, was due to his colleague Vincent of Beauvais (1264) who was also the author of a vast popular and pious encyclopedia entitled the *Grand Miroir (Speculum Majus)*[9], a faithful reflection of the rudimentary medieval knowledge of nature and the mystical aspirations of the times.

* Cf. Mandonnet, *Ecrits auth.,* p. 86.

2 G. Théry in *Rev. thorn.,* 1922, p. 376-397.

3 Cf. M. de Wulf, *Hist, de la ph. méd.,* π, p. 113-117.

4 P. Mandonnet, *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 902-905.

5 See above, p. 652.

Cf. A. 1 EETAERT, *La « Summa de poenitentia » de S. Raymond de P.,* in *Epheni. th. lov.,* 192S, p. 49-72.

‘ (t. 1.ECOY de ia Marche. *L : chairefrançaise au moyen âee,* Paris, 1886.

8 Died Archbishop of Gênes in 1298.

9 The present work contains four parts : *Speculum* I. *naturale,* 2. *doctrinale,* 3. 4. *intona··■;* the third part however is a later compilation, drawn

III. OTHER THEOLOGIANS OE THE XHIth CENTURY[1]

I. Thomism soon found its way into other religious orders. In the xmth century it was adopted by the Cistercian HUMBERT OF Br OUILLY (or Pr u l l y) (d. 1298, 2 who composed various philosophical commentaries and a treatise on preaching (all unedited); and also by the Carmelite, Ge r a r d OF BOLOGNA (d. 1317) author of a *Summa theologica* based on that of St. Thomas' by the Augustinians GILES OF Rome (1247-1316), future general of the Order, and then Archbishop of Bourges, and Ja mes OF VITERBO (d. 1307) a master at Paris in 1293, Archbishop of Benevento in 1302. From a doctrinal viewpoint Giles is the more important.

Giles of Rome 3 *(Ægidius Colonna)* was the first master in theology of the Hermits of Saint Augustine. He entered the Order at an early age and in his twentv-first vear was sent to Paris to follow St. Thomas' lectures from 1269 to 1272. When St. Thomas left Paris, Giles remembered his teaching and in 1277, though still only a Bachelor, spoke out firmly against Stephen Tempier's decrees, and was punished by being rusticated; he thus did not become master in theology until 1285. About this period, at the instance of Philip the Bold, he wrote for his son, the future Philip the Fair4, the famous treatise on education *De regimine principuni* 5 which sets out the duties of a prince asa man, as the head of a family and as a prince. Already he was greatly esteemed in his Order and the General Chapter of 1287 adopted and imposed on the Augustinians the

for the most part from St. Thomas' *Summa theologica.* This work was not imitated by St. Thomas as some have supposed.

1 P. Fé r e t, *La faculté de th. de Paris,* vols It and in passim. II. HURTER, *Nomenclator Utt.,* vol n, passim.

3 *Hist. lilt, de la France,* vol. XXI (1847), p. 86-90.

3 N. Ga v a r d i, O. S. A., *Schola agidiana* (theological synthesis based on Giles' writings), Naples, (16S3-1690). Os s in g e r, *Bibliotheca angustiaiana,* Ingoldstadt, 1768, p. 237-250. La ja r d, *Gilles de R.* in *Hist. Utt. de Ft.,* vol. 30, p. 421-556 (lile, works). N. Ma t t io l i, *Studio ciit. s. Æçidio* Á'., Rome, 1896. WERNER, *Der Augustinisinus d. sfiiteren Mittelalters,* Vienna, 18S3. N. Me r l in, *Gilles de Rome,* in *Did. th.,* col. 1358-1365.

4 He came to the throne in 1285 (d. 1314).

5 Based on Aristotle and St. Thomas' treatise *De regno (De tegimine frincipum)* which was completed by Ptolemy of L.).

young master's teaching L He was named superior general in 1292 and applied himself to fostering the habit of study in his Order. Although he was of Italian birth, both the pope and the king thought so much of him that he was raised in 1296 to the extremely important see of Bourges. The royal protection he enjoyed did not prevent him from defending papal interests in the three books *De ecclesiastica potestate*2 The two works we have mentioned do not of course comprise all Giles' writings 3. There are extant, either as published works or in manuscript, *philosophical* works, commentaries on Aristotle and various treatises (*De esse et essentia, De pluralitate formarum, De partibus philosophice essentialibus,* etc.), *theological* writings (commentaries on the Scriptures and Peter Lombard's Sentences, disputed questions and quodlibetics and many treatises on dogmatic and moral questions). His episcopal life is noteworthy for his resistance to the royal claims of Philip the Fair, his opposition to the eucharistie theory of John Quidort*, and his presence at the Council of Vienne where he spoke against the Templars. Giles died at the pontifical residence, Avignon, on December 22nd 1316.

Giles| doctrine which was also shared by his disciples—who formed what is called the Ægidian School—represents in all its more characteristic philosophical elements a sincere though hesitant Thomism. The *Doctor Fundatissimus* attempted to harmonise the ideas of his master St. Thomas with that of his spiritual father, St. Augustine. With this in mind, he considered it necessary to mutilate the powerful philosophical synthesis of the former, though not without some misgivings. As a candidate for the degree of Master in Theology in 1285 had already agreed to retract his opinion on the unity of the substantial form which he had previously maintained in defending St. Thomas against Tempier in 1277 s. As time went on he added other retractations; he professed the teaching on seminal reasons, identified (in some of his writings at least) the active intellect with the passive, etc. His intellectual independence is seen to be even more marked in particular theses: the soul is the image of God because of its operative faculties rather than its essence; the proposition

1 *Opiniones, positiones et sententias scriptas et scribendas (Analecta augustimana,* vol. II, p. 275). The last word implies unlimited confidence and caused some astonishment.

2 Cf. Ch. Jourdain. *Lin ouv. inédit de Gilles de R. en faveur de la papauté,* 1858. See below, p. 682.

3 List of works, with the edition or manuscript, in M. Merlin, *op. cit.*

4 He taught a kind of consubstantiation. Cf. *Did. th.,* art. *Eucharistie,* col. 1309. For this author, see alxwe. p. 636.

5 P. Mandonnet, *La carrière scolaire de Gilles de Rome* (1276-1291) in *Rro. sc. phil. th.,* 1910, p. 480-499.

"God exists" may be *per se nota* for the perfect; knowledge and wisdom are respectively the basis of the distinction between spiritual and natural understanding; the affective and practical nature of theology etc. *. These concessions have been attributed to a " weakness of mind"3 rather than to constructive genius. Though this judgment errs perhaps on the side of severity, Giles was certainly wrong in his narrow conception *of* the way these two great doctors agree.

2. Among the secular theologians at the encl of the XHIth century are found convinced *Thomists.*—Peter OF AUVERGNE3, for instance—and also independent though not hostile thinkers,—such as Henry of Gand and Godfrey of Fontaines. Of Peter's works there remains little except his philosophical writings, but the works of the other two deal with theology and deserve mention.

Henry of Gand.4 Archdeacon of Bruges (1276) and later (1279) of Tournai, was Master in Theology at Paris in 1277 and was regarded as an authority until his death (June 21st 1293). He is best known for his *XV Quodlibets* and a *Sumina theologica of* which he wrote no more than the introduction and the first treatise on God5. His historical importance " is due to a series of very personal doctrines which he brilliantly defended without ever making them popular. In the mass of scholastic teaching he had a few favourite problems on which he dwelt constantly and which were usually taken from metaphysics and psychology. He has been termed an Augustinian. In reality he was an eclectic Peripatetic. He revised in his own manner a group of theories that were current in early scholasticism and adapted them to the remainder of his teaching. He was greatly attracted by certain Thomist theories, such as the unity of forms for instance, and though he did not altogether subscribe to the opinions of the Dominican master, he refrained from any attacks on his teaching"6. He differed from St. Thomas in several philosophical matters: impossibility of creation *ab æterno,* individuation, multiple existences in compounds, the form of corporal beings, theory of knowledge (he admitted the identity of the soul and its faculties,

1 See especially Werner, *op. cit.*

»M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. mid.*. 11, p. 61.

3 Peter of Auvergne (d. 1304) canon of Paris, rector of the University in 1275, probably the same as Pierre du Cros (Bishop of Clermont from 1302 to 1304), composed various explanations of Aristotle, all unedited save the *Politics,* edited among the works of St. Thomas. See above, p. 542. The Dominican Bernard of Auvergne or of *Clermont* (he was elected bishop of this town after the death of P. du Cros, but never took possession) defended pure Thomism against the watered-down versions of Giles of R., Henry of Gand and Godfrey of Fontaines. Cf. Hurter, *op. cit.*

4 M. DE WULF, *Etudes sur Henri de Gand,* Louvain, 1895 (extract from the *Hist, de la phil. scoi, dans les Pays-Bas) ; Hist, de la phil. en Belgique,* Brussells, 1910, p. 80-116. J. Forget, *Henri de Gand,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2191-2194.

5 A *Liber de scriptoribus illustribus* is also ascribed to him. FORGET, *op. cit.,* lists several other writings, for the most part unedited.

'M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. mid.,* 11, p. 55-56.

he conceived the *species impressa* as an image of the object and took illumination to be a divine operation) and above all voluntarism: he was indeed one of the first to develop explicitly this teaching of the absolute superiority of the will over the intelligence and the other faculties. Duns Scotus took it from him [1]. Henry of Gand had the same ideas on the relation between philosophy and *theology* as did St. Thomas; but he had very personal ideas about the attributes of God. Like the Augustinians he gave particular emphasis to exemplarism.

Godfrey of Fontaines[2] (cl. about 1306), born at Fontaines in the region of Liege, a canon of Liege and master of theology at Paris, wrote XIV *quodlibets* which reveal an original and vigorous mind. Like all contemporary theologians he was interested in both dogmatic and moral theology, philosophy and canon law. He disassociated himself energetically from the condemnations of Thomism : "Though out of sympathy with the Dominicans in the ecclesiastical domain, he held Thomas in great esteem as a philosopher. But Godfrey's Thomism was not unalloyed : he proposed a number of personal solutions of non-essential problems and took up a pugnacious attitude towards certain contemporary masters (Giles of Rome, James of Viterbo, Thomas Sutton and especially Henry of Gand); lastly he made reservations and entertained some doubts concerning St. Thomas' innovations in scholasticism[3]. Reacting against the voluntarism of Henry of Gand, he himself fell into the opposite excess of intellectualism[4]. His doctrines came in for criticism in their turn, especially by Bernard of Auvergne[5].

CHAPTER XII.

John Duns Scotus.

Special Bibliography :

Editions : *Opera omnia* (Wadding's Ed.) Lyons, 1639, 12 vols. Reprinted at Paris 1891 by Vivès (without critical apparatus). *Capitalia opera* (partial ed., Fr. Deodat-Marie), Le Havre, 1908-1911. Innumerable other partial editions. New critical edition (indispensable) in preparation at Quaracchi.

Studies : General study : P. Raymond, O. M. Cap., *Duns Scot,* in *Diet, théol.y* col. 1865-1947 : needs bringing up to date as regards

[1] See below, p. 647 sq.

[3] M. DE WULF, *Etudes sur... G. ae Fontaines,* Louvain, 1904; various editions of quodlibets. Pelzer, *G. de F.,* in *Rev. nio-scol.,* 1913, ρ· 3^5*3^> 491-532. Féret, *op. cit.,* 111, p. 215-220. Lajard, *Hist. liti, de Franci,* vol. 21, p. 550-556.

[3] M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. mid.,* 11, p. 52, cf. *ibid.,* p. 52-54.

[*] *ibid.,* p. 54. — [5] See alxwe p. 641 note 3.

the works; fairly complete bibliogr., col. 1942-1947 : points out the best commentators of Scotus: F. Lychet (d. 1520), Mastrius (d. 1676), etc. Recent studies on his life and works: P. de Martigné, *La scol. et les trad, francise.*, Paris, 1888 (p. 249-427). A. Callebaut, in *Arch, franc, hist.*, 1917, 1920 (Scotland, the country of D. Sc.), 1924 (D. Sc. student at Paris about 1293-1296). E. Longpré, in *Francefrancise.*, 1928 (for the Holy See, against Gallicanism). A. Pelzer, *Le itr livre des Reportata par.*, in *Ann. Inst. sup. Phil.*, Louvain, 1923, p. 449-491 ; *Z?. Scot et les études scotistes*, in *Rev. neo-scol.*, 1923, p. 410-420. Pelster, S. J., various studies in *Franz. Studien*, 1923 etc. Ch. Balic, O.F. M., notes in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1926, p. 551-566; *Les Comment, de J. D. Scot sur les IVlivres des Sentences*, Louvain, 1927. Cf. G. Théry, in *Rev. sc. phil. théol.*, 1928, p. 291-295. Recent doctrinal studies : P. Minges, *1st D. Scotus indeterminist?* Munich, 1905; *Die Gnadenlehre..*, Munster, 1906; and other pamphlets and articles. J. Klein, *Gottesbegriff des J. D. Scot*, Paderborn, 1913. S. Belmont, various articles in *Rev. de phil.*, 1908 etc. P. Raymond, in *Etudes fr.*, 1909 sq. E. Longpré, *La philos, du B. D. Scot*, Paris, 1924 (Extract from *Et. franc.*, 1922-1924) : vigorous refutation of a thesis by B. Landry *(La phil. de D. Scot*, Paris, 1922) ; warm defence of Scotism : corrects many current and ill-founded prejudices. Z. Van de WOESTYNE, *Cursus philosophicus*, Malines, 1921 (Manual "ad mentem Scoti"). M. DE Wui.F, *Hist. ph. méd.*, n (1925), p. 64-84. See also A. Vacant, *Essai sur la ph. ate D. Scot comparée à celle de S. Th.*, Paris, 1891 (Ext. from *Ann. phil. chr.*, 1887-1889). Déodat Marie de Basly, *Grandes thèses cath.*, 1900, 1903. E. Gilson, *Avicenne et le foint de départ de D.Scot*, in *Arch, d'hist. doct.*, 1927, p. 89-149. H. MacDonaGH, *La notion d'être dans la métaphysique de J. Duns Scot*, in *Rev. néo-scol.*, 1928, p. 400-417; 1929, p. 80-96, 148-181.

I. LIFE AND WORKS.

The future official doctor of the great family of Franciscans was destined, like St. Thomas, to devote his life to teaching. His life was much shorter than that of St. Thomas, particularly if he was born in 1274[1]. Unfortunately we know but little of his early years. He would seem to have been born in Scotland at Duns from whence he gets his name[2]. At an early age he entered the Franciscan Order and went to Oxford for his studies. The intellectual atmosphere of the University was admirably suited to his vigorous and acute mind. During this period he conceived the systematisation of Franciscan theology; a system that was to be

[1] As one tradition affirms. According to others he was born in 1266.

[2] Other traditions claim that he was a native of England or Ireland. *Scotus* may imply that his parents were *Scots*, but not necessarily so. As for *Duns*, if it is not a family name but a place name, it should be read for "of Duns", an expression found in none of the manuscripts.

wary of Thomist innovations while making a large use of Aristotelian theories. He began his teaching at Oxford before going to Paris about 1302. He had already visited the latter town about 1293-1296; but it was not until 1302 that he obtained the degree of Master. He remained in Paris until 1307 when he was led to affirm his doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This gave rise to the legend of the famous " actus sorbonicus " when he is supposed to have replied to 200 arguments and won over all the Parisian doctors to his side [1]. Pie was sent to Cologne in 1307 where he pursued his brilliant teaching. He died suddenly on November 8th 1308. In some localities he is honoured as Blessed Duns Scotus [2].

The extent of the writings of Duns Scotus is far from being finally determined. To judge by the most recent critical researches a very great many are wrongly attributed to him [3]. The majority of the purely philosophical[4] works is due to other writers, particularly the commentaries on Aristotle's treatises (*Physics, Metaphysics* [5];* probably *Logic* and the treatises *on the soul).* Similarly the *Speculative Grammar,* the *De rerum principiis**, the *Theorems* (which date from after Occam)[7], must be rejected, as well as the *Metaphysical Conclusions* and the opusculum *de perfectione Statuum**. In the realm of pure philosophy however the *Metaphysical Questions*[9] are undoubtedly by Scotus, as is also the *De primo principio,* one of the master's first writings. This opusculum is " constructed with mathematical exactitude yet pervaded with sublime mystical aspirations... this treatise is a beautiful contemplation of God and his infinite perfections in the manner of St. Anselm's prayers and meditations ?... (it) must have been written only under the influx of an extraordinary grace of prayer" [10]. The chief works of Scotus, however, are his great *Commentary of the Sentences,* composed at Oxford, from whence it derives its name of *Opus oxoniense,* and a second, taken down during his lectures, which is claimed to represent his teaching at Paris; it summarises the first great work"

1 Cf. X. le Bachelet, *Immac. Concept.,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1076 sq.

3 " His name is honoured with a public and immemorial cultus at Noia, in Hungary, at Cologne and in Spain, and the time does not appear far distant when the Roman Curia will deign to give to it the sanction of its high authority P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1866.

3 See especially E. Longpré, *op. at.,* p. 16 sq.

4 Vols l-iv of Wadding's edit.

5 The edited text (vol iv) contains, after the explanation, *conclusiones* and *quasiiones:* the latter alone are by Scotus. The textual commentary is due to Antonius Andreæ (see p. 669) and the conclusions to Gonzalvo of Bilboa.

* Defence of the 1277 condemnations, probably anterior to Scotus. See E. Longpré, *op. cit.,* p. 22-29.

7 *Ibid.,* p. 29-51. — 8 *Ibid.,* p. 20-22. — 9 Sec note 5.

10 E. Longpré, *op. cit.,* p. 17-18.

Yet according to Pelster the *Oxoniense* dates from after the *Parisiense.* The question has not yet been definitely solved.

This is the *Opus parisiense.* These two works suffice to make him famous. But two series of undoubtedly authentic questions must be added; the *Collationes parisienses* and the *Quodlibets'.*

The Opus oxoniense [2]3 is the main work of Duns Scotus and is become, as it were "the manual of his School The work is a *Commentary of the Sentences,* following, like all similar treatises, the order of the contents of the books of Peter Lombard, though the writer's ideas are developed in a very original manner. One of its characteristics is "a too frequent recourse to *philosophical discussion.* Duns Scotus was drawn to this both by his own intellectual preferences and the traditions of Oxford University. He grafted long philosophical dissertations on to theological questions... [3]. Where other doctors touched but lightly on these subjects, Duns Scotus fondly lingered. In consequence his method suffers and, lacks cohesion "[4]. Another outstanding characteristic of his commentaries is that he "manifestly *plays the critic...* This was no doubt due to his peculiar circumstances. The most illustrious doctors were dead or on the point of disappearing. Their opinions deserved to be taken into consideration and the new doctor felt himself bound to consult them before he formed his own theories ". Hence his custom of beginning with an explanation and a thorough examination of these opinions (whose authors he did not name, but which his hearers recognised); hence, also, arose " the need of criticising whatever he felt to be erroneous or arbitrary "[5]. He was no controversialist, however, but aimed above all at constructing a new synthesis; his philosophy had no other purpose.

The Reportata parisiensia[6] *(Opus parisiense) are* another commentary of the Sentences. They were made by Scotus at Paris probably from 1302 onwards, and based on the

' Even the authentic works give rise to serious critical problems. This is patent in Fr. Balie's study, and we await the new edition of the writings of the *Doctor subtilis.*

[3] *Quacsttoues in libros IV Sententiarum; Opera omnia,* vols V-x.

[3] "Study of intellectual knowledge (bk. I, dist. in); theories of the univocal predication of being (bk. I, d. vin, q. 3); on formal distinction *(ibid.,* q. 4); on the principle of individuation (bk. II, d. Ill), on matter and form *(ibid.,* d. XII); on the permanency of the elements in mixtures *(ibid.,* d. XV); on corporal forms (bk. IV, d. Xi)". P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1S70.

[4] P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1870-1871. — * *Ibid.,* col. 1870.

[6] *Opera omnia,* vol. XI. Also called *Leciti»a parisiensis.*

Oxford work [1]. We do not possess Duns Scotus' own text but merely a "reportation" and even this, at least as regards the first book[2], was not revised by the author. Furthermore, book III is incomplete. The master's disciples continued it "with an abridged transcription of the Oxford commentaries... It contains, with but a few slight variants, the same teaching as the *Opus oxoniense*" [3]. Despite its methodical qualities which give it the appearance of a Scotist *Summa* this work found less favour with the Franciscan theologians than did the great commentary. This may be explained I. by the scarcity of first editions; 2. the very summary nature of the explanations; 3. instructions coming from superiors of the Order. Recent criticism appears to confirm earlier judgments and considers the *Opus oxoniense* as the better authority.

II. THEOLOGIAN AND PHILOSOPHER.

A). The Theologian.

Duns Scotus stands alone as the master of the Franciscan School. The proverbial shrewdness of the *Doctor subtilis* made him peculiarly fitted to train theologians capable of resisting the assaults that were made on the School by those who professed Thomism. For a long period it was usual to stress the contrast between Duns Scotus and St. Thomas. In our time the tendency is to smooth down the differences, either by rejecting several writings whose origin and teaching are doubtful, or by considering Scotus as one who carried on the work of St. Bonaventure rather than as the founder of a new movement and the forerunner of Ockham. Whatever may be thought of the latter thesis, it is beyond all doubt that Scotism possessed a traditional link with the Franciscan theological doctrinal movement

[1] According to the manuscrits, book I dates from 1302 and book IV from 1303. For unknown reasons book IV was commented before books II and III.

[2] Mgr Pelzer *(op. cit.)* has shewn that the edited text is but William Aenwick's summary of the *reportation* that Duns Scotus revised and which is still unedited.

[3] P. Raymond, *op. cit.*, col. 1871. "Several early solutions are explained with a new exactitude, and fresh views are found in the course of other questions previously treated from another angle in the *Opus oxoniense*. Duns Scotus was influenced by the atmosphere of the universities in which he taught. In this work the purely philosophical digressions are briefer, the method clearer and more uniform". *Ibid.*

in the XIIIth century. St. Bonaventure and Scotus cannot of course be placed on the same footing: the ardent mystical flights of the master are less apparent in the disciple in whom the philosopher predominates; nevertheless it has been admirably observed that " from the pen of Duns Scotus came a splendid *metaphysical justification* of all the Franciscan mystical efflorescence in the XIIIth century " J. This characteristic should not be forgotten.

Whatever may have been averred to the contrary, Duns Scot was indubitably a constructive thinker. Faced with systems whose soundness he suspected, he had to criticise before rejecting an opinion -, yet he never destroyed for the sake of destruction as is evident from his procedures, lie sought rather to build up. And first, as a true theologian lie was careful to base his work not only on the Scriptures but also on *the Fathers* : " His Patrology] was no less rich than that of other xmth century doctors. He frequently quotes St. Anselm and St. John Damascene. His favourite author, one whose authority stands in the first rank and one whose genius he found particularly attractive, was undoubtedly St. Augustine: he quotes him more than 1300 times in his commentaries of Peter Lombard and his other theological works. Duns Scotus was not afraid of criticising even the Fathers; but how discreetly !" 4. When occasion demanded he disputed the teaching of Franciscan masters who had preceded him; but as a rule he was faithful to their doctrines s, completing their labours with his own ingenious *synthesis*.. "Fie has a system; his explanations are coherent and vigorously^ compressed, despite the somewhat intricate moulding of their style. A few great ideas illuminate and maintain his metaphysical and theological edifices; the goal of his labours and his incisive argumentation was to strengthen them and render them victorious" 6.

The special characteristic of the Scotist synthesis is well expressed in the idea that gave it birth : " Duns Scotus

' E. Longpré, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

' He usually differed from St. Thomas and still more from Henry of Gand. Cf. E. LONGPRÉ, *op. cit.*, p. 258-272 and 280-286.

3 "Courteous and unbiased, his criticism possessed the serene objectivity of science which loves none but truth ". *Ibid.*, p. 263.

4 P. Raymond, *op. cit.*, col. 1940.

SE. Longpré, *ibid.*, p. 242-255, 259-270 and passim. — 6 *Ibid.*, p. 272-273.

possessed the typically Franciscan ambition of elaborating a general conception of the order present in all creation *from the point of view of love"* \ There is no question here of moral or mystical theology but of " metaphysical *speculation* a "speculative synthesis" embracing by means of a sturdy organisation the *whole* of Franciscan thought, in philosophy, theology and mysticism : all from the point of view of love. And it is thus that love rules and orders all the outstanding theses in the metaphysical and religious synthesis of Duns Scotus. Love lies at the beginning of all the ways to the Trinity *ad extra.* Similarly it is the condition of the return of all creatures to their First Principle. And finally it is love that will consummate the eternal union of the elect with God. Such is the cycle of love conceived by Blessed Duns Scotus " [1]. Quite different was the synthesis of St. Thomas whose sole purpose was to furnish an objective explanation of truth [3]. The intellectualism of the Angelic Doctor is often contrasted with the *voluntarism* of Duns Scot. The meaning of these terms should be properly grasped.

Voluntarism is one of the most characteristic theses of Duns Scotus. It consists in a particular application of the preceding teaching concerning the preponderation of the idea of good or of love. Voluntarism is " the doctrine of the primacy and independence of the will with regard to the intelligence " [4]. By this is meant a primacy or superiority *in se* and not merely relative : St. Thomas admits that in the practical moral order as we know it in this world the will ranks before the intelligence and the love of God before understanding [5], but he maintains the intelligence to be nobler *¿n se* [6], which Scotus denies. One of the reasons invoked by' St. Thomas is the dependence of the

1 *Ibid.,* p. 273.

2 *Ibid.,* p. 139140. In short, the idea of *Good* rules his speculation. Was it this that prevented Scotus from constructing a perfect metaphysical system of Being? " *A synthesis of Being as such ;* that is what we expected from Scotus and what he was unable to give us", declares Fr. Mac Donagli at the end of his acute study (*op. cil.,* p. 181). With some severity the same author states, a few lines previously, that he does not observe " that Scotus gives the impression of possessing a truly metaphysical mind. He never states his opinions as necessary *de se ".* *Ibid.,* p. 1So.

3 See above p. 579 sq.

4 P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. iSSo. Cf. *op. ox.,* bk. IV, d. xi.ix.

s *Sum. th.,* Ia, q. S2. See above p. 617.

6 Cf. R. Garrigôu-Lagrange, *Perf. chrét. et contemp.,* p. 164-173.

will with regard to the known object which forces its adherence when God, the Perfect Good, is in question. Scotus puts this aside, without however rejecting the principle: *nil voliturn nisi prcecogniturn;* even in the presence of the perfect good, he says, the will retains its indétermination and no other reason for its determination can be found than the will itself; it alone is the total cause of its act[1]. This thesis has its roots in Scotist psychology, which allows the faculties and particularly the will, a greater *activity* than does St. Thomas[2]. It extends its influence even into Theodicy and moral theology; hence its importance. The terms however should not be exaggerated; Scotus affirms that intellection is more than a condition of willing; it acts as final cause, by way of attraction[3]. Furthermore, as will be explained below, voluntarism does not rule out speculation, even the boldest variety.

The synthesis thought out by Duns Scotus was, like that of St. Thomas, a theological synthesis. The generous measure he accords to speculation derives from his confidence in philosophy, capable of shewing the harmony between reason and faith[4]. Sometimes, it is true, he appears to grudge theology the dignity of a *science,* especially in the Prologue of the *Opus oxoniense* (q. Ill, n. 26-28) but here, it would seem, he merely desires to underline the differences that distinguish theology from human sciences in the strict Aristotelian sense, and to affirm that it is a very special science or knowledge[5]. He looks upon it as a practical science, since the truths of faith that it studies tend to make God loved as He should be loved[6]. Similarly, the whole of his doctrine is strongly systematised by means of metaphysical principles that animate his synthesis and distinguish it from that of St. Thomas.

B). Philosophical principles.

With M. de Wulf we may reduce the main doctrines characteristic of Scotus' teaching to four : *metaphysical*

[1] *Rep. par.,* bk. 11, d. 25, q. I, n. 20. Cf. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* n, p. 22-23, 77-79. E. Longpré, *op. cit.,* p. 201-226. — [2] *Ibid.,* p. 203-205.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 219-224. Fr. Longpré has even found in Scotus expressions that attribute to knowledge a partial efficient causality on the will *(ibid.,* p. 222-214).

[4] Cf. Parthenius Minges, *Das Verhaltniss ziu. Glauben u. Jl'isse//...* Paderborn, 190S. —[3] P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1872-1873.

[5] *Op. ox.,* IV, prol., q. iv, n. 31-32, 37-38. P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1873.

formalism; the *univocal predication of being: intuitionism; voluntarism,*

"The distinction *formalis a parte rei* *, or formalism, pervades the whole system. It allows the display of the wealth of the individual substance, the enlargement of the metaphysical apparatus and the insertion of entities one within the other in order to ensure fidelity to individualism. From one viewpoint it renders the real more complex since it gives to internal entities an independent value *(a parte ret)* that Thomism denies them. From another viewpoint it simplifies it, since it interprets it in the light of a homogeneous principle : the real distinction between essence and existence, the soul and its faculties disappears, as does the virtual distinction between truth and good, or the divine attributes[1].

"The univocal predication of being is another Scotist characteristic, a new way of establishing the hierarchy of the real, with God at the summit[3]. Thanks to this theory which rules all his metaphysics (alias metaphysica non esset magis transcendens quam physica, *Op.* o.r., bk. I, d. ili, q. 3), deep affinities are established between all the ramifications of reality, the adequate object of the intelligence and the will, and human thought may thus attain to God. The theory of universal predication was strictly personal to Duns Scotus and was the result of entirely original thought[4].

"Psychological intuitionism was not invented by Scotus, but it had his blessing and was incorporated in Scotism and Occamism in the Xlllth century. From the epistemological viewpoint the theory that the intelligence has an intuition of the thing-that-exists intensifies Scholastic dogmatism : it explains in a different way from Thomism the contact of the intelligence with the individual; it shews whai confidence Scotus placed in reason[5].

1 The Scotist *formal distinction* is that which exists between various formalities. The *formalities,* to Scotus' mind, are the metaphysical realities or rather elements contained in all individual reality and capable of being grasped by the mind. The formal distinction thus exists in things, while the *virtual distinction* of the Thomists is in the mind, although it has its roots in reality, and it is precisely that which Scotus calls " formalities

2 Longpré considers the theory of Duns Scotus as an " ingenious systematisation of fifty years of research and speculation" (p. 240). M. de Wulf sees it as a return to exaggerated realism (p. 70-71). We would merely point out that such a teaching adds something new to Aristotle's metaphysics.

3 In *leality,* says Scotus, created being is analogous with respect to God, the Being *per se,* in which every creature participates. But *the concept* that the mind forms of one and the other is univocal, *qua* concept, since it is applied to diverse realities : its proper object is being, inasmuch as it is being, and abstracted from its highest modalities *(per se* or *ab alio).* Cf. *Op. ox.,* bk. I, d. ii, q. II, n. 3. The accusation that he puts God in a genus is unfounded.

4 See P. MacDonagh, *op. cit.*

5 At the starting point of intellectual knowledge and as the basis of abstract and universal knowledge (which he explains like St. Thomas) Duns Scotus supposes an intuitive knowledge of *the concrete and singular being (species specialissima)* perceived as existing. This very vague knowledge is gradually clarified by means of abstraction and reflection.

"The voluntarism that Scotus borrowed from Henry of Gand[1] gives first place to action... Duns Scotus throws into relief the active character of the soul" It has been said of him that "he restored the idea of activity to Scholasticism"[2]. It may at least be admitted that he stressed this point more than others[4]. He calls as his witness the great Augustinians of the preceding century[5], and these claims are rendered especially interesting by the fact that St. Augustine in other times and other circumstances, but with a contrary intention, implied a passivity that amounted almost to fatalism[6].

These great principles with their infinite applications sufficed for the renown of Duns Scotus. But to these central ideas of his system must be added other points that finally determined the doctrine of his School.

These are to be found in nearly every branch of philosophy. *In metaphysics,* in addition to his formalism and the universal predication of being, must be mentioned the Scotist conception of primary matter (endowed with a certain actuality)[7], individuation (consequence of a formality, termed *hcecceitas}* [8], personality (mere non-dependence, both actual and potential)[9],* actuality and potentiality (relations added to the subject from within or without "*respectus intrinsece* or *extrinsece advenientes*)",[0], etc. ***In psychology,*** besides intuitionism and voluntarism, it should be noted that Scotus threw over the Bonaventuran illumination and substituted an explanation of knowledge closely resembling Thomism Scotus gives man a bodily form as well as the reasoning soul, a form whose single reality contains three formalities. The soul is immortal, but no decisive metaphysical reasons for this can be given". *In moral philosophy,* though not neglecting the intellectual elements, Scotus is led by his voluntarism to attribute the greatest importance to the will in every domain. This is a matter of principle and not applicable only for practical ends and in the present life. The importance of action is also greatly stressed [13].

The philosophy of Duns Scotus undoubtedly bears the mark of originality. Its inspiration, no doubt, is to be found in xmth century Augustinianism, but it transcends the latter in the matter of the new theories it advances, and

1 See above p. 641.

3 M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. méd.,* 11, p. 82. See above p. 64S.

3E. Longpré, *op. cit.,* p. 275.

4 "Duns Scotus would never admit that an essentially active faculty, no matter how it was conditioned or by what motives it was solicited, could act in the manner of a naturally passive faculty or an element that was *necessario* determined ; there can never be a perfect equation of these terms, but always a difference of the modality of the action. *Such is the true meaning of the voluntarism oj Duns Scotus* . *Ibid.,* p. 276.

5 *Ibid.,* p. 268-272. —6 See below, p. 667.

7 *Op. ox.* II, d. xiT, q. 2; IV, d. xi, q. 3, n. 12.

8 *Op. ox.,* II, d. Ill, q. 2-3. —9 *Ibid.,* Ill, d. I, q. I, n. 5 sq.

10 See E. Longpré, *op. cit.,* p. 42-43. — " *Op. ox.,* I, d. in, q. 3, n. 24-25.

" M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* p. 79-80. — 13 *Ibid.,* p. 80.

by its use of *Aristotelism* which had finally gained a right of entry into the Schools : but the Aristotelism of Scotus is very mild and much less rigid than that of St. Thomas whose aim was to build up a universal philosophy on the fundamental basis of reality and truth. Yet the philosophy of Scotus, aiming rather at the acquisition of good, is no less well co-ordinated and proves its author to have been well fitted to lead a School. This he did in the bosom of his own Order, which looked to his guidance even before turning to St. Bonaventure. Furthermore, his philosophy was wholly in function of his theology; and this is particularly noteworthy not only because of the special synthesis it provides, but also, and mainly, on account of the historical part played by its defenders in their final elaboration of a number of important doctrines.

HI. THE THEOLOGY OF DUNS SCOPUS.

A). God. Natural and Supernatural Theology.

I. The existence of God is not established *a priori:* Duns Scotus does not admit St. Anselm's argument, though he tried to improve it by giving it some semblance of worth L The stepping off point for the existence of God is a base in reality combined with the use of *the principle of causality* (demonstration *quia).* Furthermore, he insists that being should be considered in its metaphysical principles rather then in its physical elements, so that the demonstration may be based upon unchanging and necessary data: *procedendo ex necessariis*2 3 Hence the *a priori* appearance of his proofs ; but it no more than an appearance. One of the fundamental principles frequently invoked in his demonstration is the impossibility of an infinite series of causes : the contingent is conditioned by the necessary 3. This basic proof is supplemented by two of another kind: *final causality* and the *order of pre-eminence* or excellence.

1 In two ways: first he notes that if God is supposed to exist, which is possible without contradiction, it is impossible to think of a greater than Him: he then proceeds to observe, that thanks to his theory of intuitive knowledge, existent being is more intelligible than non-existent being. *Op. ox.,* I, d. II, q. 2. —* *Ibid.,* see E. LONGPRÉ, *op. cit.·,* p. 106 sq.

3 Aliqua (natura) est effectibilis, ergo aliqua est effectiva. Consequentia patet per naturam correlativorum. *De primo prine.*, c. HI, n° I. Infinitas est impossibilis in ascendendo, ergo primitas necessaria. *Ob. ox.,* I, d. II, q. 2. Cf. P. Raymond, *op. di.,* col. 1874-1875. I

In these three ways he comes to a first and necessary being *(primitas necessaria)* implied by essential order *(ex essentiali ordine)* even in the series of accidentally co-ordinated causes[1].

2. The Divine Nature may be known through the triple way of affirmation, negation and pre-eminence[2], the latter being based on *analogy*. In this, Duns Scotus does not leave Augustinism aside, as some have claimed[3]; he retains the traditional analogism and exemplarism[4]. Nor is his theory of universal predication a stumbling block. In reality this imperfect univocacy of the Scotists would seem to be no more than an *analogy* seen from a *positive* angle[5]. At the sanu time, Duns Scotus emphasises the idea of *infinity*. Longpré remarks that "he gives a clear, rigorous, and sharply defined idea to the vague conceptions of the Greek philosophers who confused it with indefiniteness"[6]. From this idea the Scotist theory of the *divine perfections* is built up. The latter are thrown into high relief and even distinguished as true formalities and this, asserts the Subtle Doctor, in no way prejudices, the divine simplicity[7].* Despite the opposition aroused by this new theory[8] "there has never been an ecclesiastical condemnation of formal distinctions in God"[9].

The attributes of God, having been thus formally distinguished are classed under two heads by Scotist theologians. "The first group comprises those perfections which, as it were, preserve God from the imperfections of creatures: these are *the intrinsic modes* (Scotus

1 This position, says Longpré, is characteristic of Duns Scotus and distinguishes him both from St. Thomas and Ockham. *Ibid.,* p. 107, n. 4.

2 *Op. ox.,* I, d. vin, q. 3, n. 8; q. 4, n. 6.

3E. Longpré, *op. cit.,* p. 91-101.

‹ Cf. *ibid.,* p. 98-100.

5 *Ibid.,* p. 101. "The infinite is sharply distinguished from the indeterminate. It may be defined in two ways, either directly or in relation to the finite. Of itself, in its basic meaning, infinity is being, in full and simultaneous possession of all perfections. 'Relative to limited and circumscribed being, infinity is transcendent being, to which nothing else is comparable". *Ibid.,* p. 101. —6 *Op. ox.,* I, d. vin, q. 4.

? Duns Scotus, however, bases it upon the writings of early doctors, particularly St. Augustine. Cf. E. Longpré, *op. cit.,* p. 242-255.

8 P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1876. The author adds: "Though this teaching is *mysterious and obscure,* must we not confess that the virtual distinction, now more exact that in the Ninth century, is still no more successful in dissipating the mist which hides the formal and objective reality of the divine perfections?" The latter at least possesses the advantage of not making the mystery still more mysterious.

mentions five: simplicity, immutability, eternity, invisibility, ineffabiliy) The second is composed of simple perfections, found in a limited manner in creatures, but infinitely in God. To these is given the special name of *attributes:* all relate to the intelligence and the will" s. Scotus devotes much space to these attributes, treating them not only by the light of faith but also reason. He considers reason capable of proving not only the unity and infinity of God, but also His mode of life, made up of intelligence and will, His truthjustice, universal providence, all-embracing and infinite powers: yet he denies that philosophy, or at least Aristotelian philosophy, can prove by means of rigorous arguments, God's power of " producing *quodcumque possibile* without the help of some immediate cause" or that it can demonstrate the Divine omnipresence45

The divine life consists essentially of intellection and will. But neither the intelligence nor the will comes first in God. Both depend on His *essence,* which is the first in reality just as it is the first concept we have of God. The first act that derives from it, is intellection: the act of willing follows. It is thus inexact to affirm that to Scotus' mind God is essentially and primarily will, liberty s. The *divine ideas* are exhaustively treated in his Theodicy. They are not to be confused with God's essence; they are distinct formalities. The exemplary ideas are "objective presentations of the creature in the divine mind"6. The *Doctor subtilis* nevertheless gives to God's will a characteristic that has been termed *voluntarism* by his followers 7.* It consists in the affirmation, first, that freedom is so essential to the divine will that " it never acts by a natural necessity, even though the act that it produces could not be other on account of its very perfection"8. It has been wrongly inferred from this indetermination that Scotus attributed a capricious and despotic will to God: what he maintains is that the irrational is impossible9. And it is pointed out10 that Scotus considers the existence rather than the essence of things when he speaks of the autonomy of the divine will; if so, he differs from the Thomists only by his insistence on this viewpoint.

His teaching on predestination is also very similar to that of St. Thomas. Divine foreknowledge of merit does not bind the divine will to vouchsafe grace and glory to the *elect;* the only motive for this decision is the divine will itself. The sufficient and ultimate reason for this decree is found in the goodness of God. *Reprobation,*

1 Cf. P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1876-1878.

3 *Ibid.,* col. 1875. — 3 *Ibid.,* col. 1875-1881.

* M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* p. 73.

5 E. Longi'RÉ, *op. cit.,* p. 197-201.

6 M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* p. 74.

7 "The Theodicy of Duns Scotus is characterised, like his Psychology, by voluntarism, i. e., by the doctrine of the primacy and independence of thé will with regard to the intelligence" says Fr. Raymond; *op. cit.,* col. 1880.

8 P. Raymond, *ibid.* Cf. *Quod.* xvi.

s *Op. O.X.,* IV, d. X, q. 2. Cf. E. Longpré, *op. cit.,* p. 56-60 and 200.

» See M. de Wulf, *où. cit.,* p. 74.

however, supposes foreknowledge of perseverance in sin, for it may not be conceived other than as an act of justice r.

3. The Trinitarian theology of Duns Scotus contains a number of noteworthy peculiarities. *The generation of the Word* is not the simple intellection by which God knows His essence, even inasmuch as this knowledge "connotât relationem paternitatis"; it is attributed "to a special act logically posterior and formally distinct from the first. Scotus terms it *dictio.* This act proceeds from the *memoria facunda,* i. e., the intelligence as possessing its essential object, and it is this that forms the basis of the relation of paternity" 2. As regards the procession of the Holy Ghost, "the Subtle Doctor discerns two acts of love in God. The first is consequent on God's essential knowledge of Himself, His attributes, and the other Persons; this love precedes the procession of the Holy Ghost and the generation of the Word 3. Yet the Word is not engendered by this act of love, since He is produced *via natura* and not *via voluntatis**. The second act of love is given the name of *spiratio.* It is common to the Father and the Son, Who thus produce the Holy Ghost. *Spiratio* is therefore a very special act of the will which is both free, with that freedom that constitutes the essence of the will, and necessary, since its object is the infinite essence that the Father and the Word necessarily love"5. Other special points are to be found in this Trinitarian teaching arising from Duns Scotus' idea of personality and, in consequence, involve a further use of the formal distinction4.

B). The Man-God. Mary.

All the principles we have already mentioned find their application in one of the most characteristic doctrines of Scotism, a teaching whereby the Subtle Doctor differs not only from St. Thomas, but also from St. Bonaventure. The ruling principle is the " infinitely rational and sovereignly ordained will of God "7. " Precisely because he had meditated upon this truth, i. e., that reason, order and wisdom are the norm of the infinite will, he reconstructed reality, the order actually

' Raymond, *op. cit.,co*\. 1881. — ' *Ibid.,co*\. 18S2.—* *Rep.par.,* i,d. vi, q. 2.

4 Scotus bases himself not on the diverse nature of the acts of intelligence and will, but on the opposition of the manner of their production : the intelligence, determined by its object, acts *via natura;* the will, undetermined, acts freely as is proper to it *(via voluntatis).* P. Raymond, *ibid.*

5 *Ibid,,* col. 1882-1883. 6 *Ibid.,* col. 1883-1884.

7 E. Longpré, *op. cit.,* p. 55.

existing, upon a different plan from that of St. Bonaventure, and placed the Incarnation at the outset of all God's ways *ad extra.* All the synthesis of Duns Scotus—Incarnation, elevation to the supernatural order, revelation, creation 1[4]—depends on this fundamental truth"'.

According to Duns Scotus 3, the Incarnation of the Word cannot be closely subordinated to the foreknowledge of original sin and the Redemption. Were this the case, the predestination of Christ would have been merely occasioned, and this the Subtle Doctor refuses to admití such a doctrine " does not fully satisfy the primacy that becomes the purpose of a well-ordered will. But as this purpose in God is the glorification of the divine essence through love, and since in the carrying out of this design the homage of the Incarnate Word transcends all other adoration, it follows that the primary object of the divine will *ad extra* is the heart of Christ, and that the immensity of its love, apart from all the rest, is the first cause of His predestination 5. As may be seen, Duns Scotus does not directly seek to determine whether the Incarnation would have taken place had man not sinned6,7 but was obliged to treat it as a consequence. The teaching of Duns Scotus represents a magnificent intellectual effort to give to the Man-God the place that becomes Him according to the *order of dignity* in the universe as it actually exists, despite the fact that the identification of this order with the *order of intention* entails reading a great deal into the biblical texts 7. This Scotist conception is notable for its piety[8],9 though not necessarily more so than the traditional doctrine?,

1 *Op. ox.,* Ill, q. XXXII, q. I, n. 6.

3 E. LONGPRÉ, *op. cit.,* p, 55. Cf. *ibid.,* p. 139-140.

3 Duns Scotus here takes a teaching of Alexander of Hales and Albert the Great and incorporates it in his general synthesis after having given it a new and deeper meaning by linking it up with the doctrine of predestination.

4 P. Raymond, *Le motifde I'Incarnation,* in *Etudes franc.,* 1912 (vol. XXVll), p. 193-197·

5 E. Longpré. *op. cit.,* p. 142. See *ibid.,* p. 139-147. Cf. Deodat de Basly, *Conférences seton la doctrine du V¿n. Duns Scot,* Paris, 1900.

6 Later theologians usually propose the theory in this manner.

7 These texts refer to God's love for man, rather than of human love glorifying God: "Sic Deus dilexit mundum ut filium suum Unigenitum daret" *(Joan.,* ili, 16). These and similar texts of course may give rise to various theological speculations.

8 Adopted by St. Francis of Sales, Mgr Gay and other spiritual writers, as well as such outstanding theologians as Suarez.

9 God's love for man, which is stressed in the traditional teaching, especially in the mysteries of Christ's Passion, obviously tends to kindle a greater love of God in man.

His explanation of the hypostatic union is also affected by his original theories and especially his idea of *personality*. For Duns Scotus, *subsistence* is closely akin to the complete nature, " to which it merely adds a negation of dependency with regard to other realities' '*. The Subtle Doctor however had no intention of breaking up the theandric compound in the Man-God2; though it is not easy to see how any interpretation 3 of his theory permits not only the juxtaposition of the human and divine nature but also the assumption of the former by the Word, and the maintenance of substantial unity4. On the other hand Duns Scotus distinguishes in Christ, not only two essential beings or natures, but also " *two beings in the order of existence;* an uncreated existence, privilege of the divine nature, and a created existence proper to human nature. He gives many proofs for this opinion; they are based on a fundamental principle: the real non-distinction between essence and existence " 5.

The teaching of Duns Scotus on the Redemption is also very personal 6* He is at one with the great doctors of the XIIIth century in denying the doctrine of ransom, since God is able to dispense with all satisfaction, even granted the hypothesis of salvation. Furthermore, had God exacted an equivalent satisfaction, every man, with the help of grace, could have satisfied for his otvn sins, and, with the aid of super-eminent grace *(sunima gratia)* for those of the entire human race 7; for sin is not infinitely grave. Even the merits of Christ, moreover, possess " no intrinsic infinity Scotus nevertheless attributes to them a "certain extrinsic infinite worth" since God accepted Christ's meritorious acts " not only as meritorious, but as possessing an infinite value " 8.

Duns Scotus' chief claim to fame will always be his defence of the *Immaculate Conception of Our Lady*. This teaching, which had been implicitly believed for hundreds of years both in the Western and the Eastern Church suffered a period of obscurity and controversy in the Latin

* A. Michel, *Hypostase,* in *Did. théol.*, col. 411-413.

3 According to Suarez, the Scotist theory tends to this. Cf. L. Mahieu, *Suarez,* p. 252.

3 Some reduce it to Tiphanius' doctrine (the person is the nature, considered in its substantial totality). Cf. Michel, *ibid.,* col. 413-415.

4 *Ibid.,* col. 415. — 5 P. Raynomd, *op. cit.,* col. 1890.

6P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1894-1896.

? *Op. ox.,* III, d. XX, n. 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 12.

8 P. Raymond, *ibid.,* col. 1896. See also J. Senwane, *Hist. Dogm.,* IV, p. 514-520. J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption,* p. 368-371. While absolving Scotus from " rationalism " (Sabatier), Rivière severely criticises his sotcriological teaching : " He offers us but a paltry conception of the mystery, and perhaps unsettles its foundations altogether " ; p. 369.

Church during the XIIth century[1]. For various reasons and especially for fear of narrowing the universal application of the Redemption, the great doctors hesitated to commit themselves, or else were openly hostile to the pious belief, which nevertheless gained ground steadily. William of Ware[2], an Oxford Franciscan was one of its ardent protagonists; but it was *Duns Scotus*[3] who carried most weight. He taught that the preservation of Mary from original sin increased rather than lessened the dignity of Christ[4] and successfully answered the many objections that were raised. In this matter his critical mind was a useful instrument in the cause of truth. Henceforward the teaching of the Immaculate Conception rapidly advanced in favour, even in theological circles, where it was particularly fostered by the Franciscans[5]. The decree of the Council of Basle (1439) though lacking all theological and juridical value has its origins in the influence of the Franciscans and Duns Scotus: it ended the period of bitter dispute and foreshadowed the triumph of Our Lady[6].

C) Man. Grace. Beatitude.

In this paragraph we propose to group together a number of distinctive theories of Duns Scotus with regard to man as he exists both in the natural and supernatural order. *Voluntarism* as might be expected plays a prominent part, not merely in psychology as we have already pointed out, but also in man's moral activity. According to Scotus the *precepts* that form the objective basis of the latter may be subject to dispensation though we must not conclude that he considers them as not deriving from natural law[7]. "Natural law is the primary basis of moral obligation : the divine command does no more than sanction its authority"[8]. Just as the moral order is not purely arbitrary if it is considered in God, neither is it so in man, for the will is a rational *appetitus*. Duns Scotus explains conscience and synderesis in the same way as St. Thomas and finds a place for the

1 X. Le Bachelet, *Immaculée Concept.*, in *Did. th.*, 995-1073.
3 *Ibid.*, col. 1060-1062. See above, p. 494. — 3 *Ibid.*, col. 1073-1078.
4 For the Redemption is thus applied more perfectly if it is the cause not only of Mary's purification but also of her *preservation*. Duns Scotus of course, like St. Thomas, rejected the current opinion regarding the transmission of original sin by concupiscence. *Ibid.*, 1075.
5 *Ibid.*, col. 1078 sq.
6 *Ibid.*, col. 1108-1115.
7 See E. Longpré, *op. cit.*, p. 80-89. The author mentions false interpretations of Scotus' teaching on this subject. Some of these are due to the fact that the Doctor often refers to God s absolute power and this is mistakenly understood to mean existing reality.
8 *Ibid.*, p. 84. Cf. *Rep. par.*, IV, d. XXXVI, q. 2, n. 5.

intellectual virtues, the *recta ratio,* prudence Yet this does not prevent him from asserting the primacy of the will.

This stressing of man's moral forces in Scotus' teaching does not lead either to Pelagianism or Semipelagianism, in spite of what some have averred. This is clearly proved by his teaching on grace. He does not, of course, " treat *ex professo* of the necessity of *actual grace.* We may nevertheless find enough exact affirmations in his writings to grasp his meaning and clear up the obscurity of several texts that have been too freely exploited by the adversaries of his school "[2]3 For the most part Scotus speaks of *habitual grace* [3]. To his mind it is a created *habitus* produced by the Holy Ghost, a permanent gift, quite distinct from the Uncreated Gift. It is to be identified with *charity* and here we have the most characteristic trait of the Scotist theology of grace [4]. " Though really identical from the point of view of their essence, grace and charity are nevertheless formally distinct. The formal reason for which, by means of the same *habitus,* the soul loves or can love God, differs from the reason for which it is accepted and loved by God : in the former it is a passive state, in the latter an active principle. As a result of this identification, Scotus assigns grace not to the essence of the soul but to a faculty, the wills. This conclusion appears to be the natural consequence of the close dependence that binds together grace, glory, and beatitude [6].

The supernatural organism is again simplified in a different manner by Scotus when he rejects *infused moral virtues,* since "by grace, the will which is the seat of the virtues of justice, fortitude and temperance, is sufficiently enobled to be able to produce the supernatural acts of these virtues " [7]. The only distinct supernatural *habitus* he admits, are faith, hope, and charity, in brief, the three theological virtues [8]. The *gifts of the Holy Ghost* are not really distinct from them [9]. This simplification may be found surprising

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 208-210.

[2] P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1899; cf. *tbia.,* 1899-1901. See similar opinion in P. Minges, *Die Gnadenlehre des D. Sc.,* Münster, 1906.

[3] Though as Raymond observes he does not always clearly distinguish it from actual grace: *ibid.,* col. 1899. —[4] *Ibid.,* col. 1901.

Op. ox., III, d. XXVII, *Rep. par.,* II, q. XXVI.

[6] P. Raymond, *op. cit.,* col. 1901. —[7] *Ibid.,* col. 1905.

[8] *Ibid.,* col. 1904-1909. —[9] *Op. ox.,* III, d. XXXIV, n. 20.

in a theologian who, more than any other, multiplied the formal entities; yet it is justified by his tendency to stress the part played by love, by the will. In any case it would be unfair to claim, in spite of certain defects, that "the Scotist theology of grace is very akin to Lutheran theology" [1].

Grace is given to us through the sacraments. On this point [2] the Scotist teaching is very similar to the Thomist. As regards their causality however Scotus follows a different line by rejecting all instrumental causality, *dispositive* as well as *physical*. On the other hand he is mistakenly credited with admitting merely an *occasional* causality: and even the modern *moral* causality does not adequately represent his theory. For Scotus, says Raymond, the sacraments are "*instrumental*" causes, containing "*morally*" (not physically) the effects that they produce in souls, in the sense that God has promised to be present and to act in the sacramental rites [3]. Among the opinions peculiar to Scotus we may mention that concerning the *essence* of penance: Scotus takes it to be absolution alone; the three acts of the penitent are only conditions; they are, of course, necessary to render the judiciary act possible and complete, and they enter into the sacrament as *partes integrantes*

The *beatitude* of reasoning beings must consist formally in an act of the *will* rather than in an act of the intelligence. The two faculties, of course, both operate *actively* in possessing God and both attain Him *directly*. But the superiority of the will over the intelligence makes its activity pre-eminent [5].

Right to the end of his work, Duns Scotus is consistent in reducing all his speculation to the idea of good, of love. This is a typically Franciscan tendency and by its means Scotus continued the work of thirteenth century moralists and mystics in the realm of metaphysics and philosophy. His School has perpetuated his labours. "And yet", says one of his disciples, "in the development of our dogmas and the elaboration of the theological synthesis, Scotist teaching has not received the same favour as the Thomist interpretations. Does this mean that nothing of Duns Scotus' theological work remains, that none of the doctrines he championed — save the Immaculate Conception of Mary — has become part of modern theology? To affirm this would certainly be imprudent and unjustified. Despite the privileged place that the authority of Leo XIII and Pius X

[1] See the refutation by E. LONGPRÉ (*op. cit.*, p. 151-160).
[2] Brief sacramentary synthesis in *Diet, th.*, loc. cit., col. 1909-1932.
[3] c°l' I9°9'1910· See *Rev. aug¿*, 1910 (vol. 16), p. 432-431.
[4] 1. Raymond, *op. at.*, col. 1921. —[5] p. Raymond, *ibid.*, col. 1935.

has given to the ideas of St. Thomas, we may be permitted to claim that the philosophical conception of our dogmas is not yet final, that it is still a rational problem and that the solutions advanced by Duns Scotus are not without honour"L

CHAPTER XIII.

Theology in the XIVth century[3].

Special Bibliography for tbe whole of the chapter (see the notes for individual authors). H. Hurter, *Nomenclator lit.*, vol. II. K. Werner, *Die Scholastik des spliteren Mittelalters,* Vienna, 1881-1887, 4 vols. M. DE WULF, *Hist, de la pini, méd,,* II, p. 147-242 ; *Hist, de la phil. en Belgique,* Louvain, 1910, p. 126 sq. FÉRET, *La faculté de th. de Paris,* vol. III. Ph. Toreilles, *Le mouvement théologique en Fr.,* Paris (undated) p. 35 sq. (very summary). L. Salembier, *Le Grand Schisme dyOccident,* Paris, 5th ed., 1921. J. Rivière, *Le problème de l|Eglise et de PEtat au temps de Philippe le B.,* Paris, 1926. N. Valois, *h Pape et le concile,* 2 vols, Paris, 1909. L. Mahieu, *François Suarez. Sa philosophie,* Paris, 1921 (Introduction and *passim).*

I. DECADENCE OF SCHOLASTICISM. OCKHAM.

A). General decadence in the XIVth century.

The XIVth and the XVth centuries were centuries of transition between the Middle Ages and the modern period. They may be attached to one or other of these epochs according to the subject that it is desired to emphasise. They may also be considered apart, the XIVth century being attached to the Middle Ages whose decline it marks, while the XVth, which saw the birth and growth of the Renaissance, is preferably regarded as the proximate preparation of the Reformation. The XIVth century also paved the way for the latter, from a negative angle inasmuch as it saw the break-up of the old order. The principles of the distinction between the old and the new world already existed, at least

[*] P. Raymond, *op. cit.*, col. 1941.

[3] In the present work we give no more than a simple general outline of the doctrinal movement in the XIVth century and in a further chapter, of lhe XVth. The history of theology during this transitional period is still too little known.

latently; but what is most striking during this century, from a doctrinal viewpoint, is the destruction that took place. The xivth century was a century of crises. The most important was the Great Schism of the West which had no outcome until the Council of Constance in 1414-1418. We shall consider this last century of the Middle Ages as coming to an end at that date.

Among the distinctive characteristics of the xivth century may be remarked various phenomena of a political or social nature whose importance must not be overlooked: we may instance the Hundred Years War and the frightful disorders that were its consequence, and the plague that laid waste Europe about 1380. From another angle there is food for thought in the middle-class invasion of great postsin the State. But these changes have but a remote connection with our subject. It is otherwise with the phenomena that follow: 1. The crumbling of *Christendom,* that moral, rather than juridical, link which bound together all the Christians of the West : the nationalism that took its place tended to an exaggerated separatism; 2. the spirit of *independence* that spread throughout Catholic Europe and led the peoples to limit not only the temporal but also the spiritual authority: the jurists of Philip the Fair were its most dangerous propagators: 3. lastly, the multiplication of the *universities* in addition to Paris and Oxford (Prague, 1348; Vienna, 1365; Heidelberg, 1316; Cologne, 1389; Erfurt, 1392; Cracow, 1397); others, still more numerous were founded in the xvth century and the mere fact of these foundations, apart from the decadence of its studies, lost Paris its intellectual ascendency'.

The decline of speculative learning was one of the outstanding traits of the xivth century: philosophy and theology, of course, were still studied in the universities, but the brilliant teaching of the great teachers of the previous century was no longer in evidence. There was on the whole little originality. A new philosophical system, absolute *nominalism,* or terminism, was born : but its chief contribution was its ardour for destruction and its founder has been termed "a great and fatal revolutionary"[1]. Ockham lightheartedly pulled down all that had made the grandeur and the strength of medieval speculation ; not only did he break up the harmony between reason and faith, but taught a mistrust of reason that borders on scepticism. He was probably swept away by his excessive delight in the *positive sciences* which took a great step forward in the Xivth century, but which had originally been the favourite subjects of the masters at Oxford[3]. Towards the end of the century the universities took an interest in *moral and economic problems* probably under the influence of the social changes that had taken place. On account of internal troubles in the Church, the theologians were faced with the distressing problem of the nature of the *supreme ecclesiastical authority* and the relations of Church and State. But the solutions put forward by the foremost teachers of the period reflect the

1 Cf. M. de Wulf, *Hist. de la ph. méd.,* II, p. 10-1^.
• L. Salembier, *op. cit.,* p. 117.
3 See above p. 494.

disorder that reigned in their minds[1],* due to their neglect of the. great principles that rule these matters and particularly their distrust *oí* even the most elementary metaphysical data[2]. To this intellectual decadence must also be attributed the growth of a certain form of spirituality.

B). Ockham.

William of Ockham[3], an English Franciscan, born a little before 1300, studied at Oxford from 1312 to 1318. He taught there as a bachelor *(inceptor*[4] and composed (before 1324) his *Commentaries on the Sentences.* In this work and a few other philosophical treatises (Commentaries on Aristotle, *Summa totius logica, Quodlibet* vu) or theological *(Centiloquium,* which reduces all speculative theology to 100 propositions) his personal teaching is to be found. In the very first years of his teaching he put forward many bold theses that were denounced to the pope. Summoned to Avignon in 1324 he remained there for four years while his case was being considered. Though he was not condemned personally, 51 of his propositions were censured in 13265. In 1328 he went to Bavaria to visit the king (emperor) Louis IV (1314-1347) whom he championed against the pope, John XXII, in a series of violent

[1] "Erroneous opinions were rife... especially in the universities. In addition to the faculties in which was taught the whole truth — faithful echo of divine revelation, — there were others where ignorance, rashness and inconsequence daily showed their face. It was chaos of opinions; it was **BabelL.** Salembier, *op. cit.,* p. 114-115.

[2] xivth century philosophy was evidently a stage towards so-called modern philosophy for which it paved the way. See E. Gilson, *Laphil. au hl.-A.,* 11, p. S3 sq. This may be looked upon as progress, if the attitude of the " modern " thinker is considered to be an advance, i. e., the position of those, who, invoking the independence of reason, arm themselves against the faith as though it were an enemy and who, trusting to their own experience, reject the greatest intellectual realities. But if we are to judge by things as they are in reality, according to their objective value rather than historically, this attitude is not progress, but regression.

[3] In addition to Feret, *op. cit.,* 111, 339-380, Hurter, *op. cit.,* 11, 525-530, M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* p. 163-174, see J. Hofer, *Biographische Studien u. IK von O.,* in *Arch, franc, hist.,* 1913. J. Maréchal, *Le point de dipart de la métaphysique,* I, Louvain, 1922. E. Gilson, *La philos, au M. A.,* lì, 1922, p. 85-136. P. DoNCŒUR, various articles in *Rev. néo-scol.,* 1920-1921; *Rev. sc. phil. th.,* 1921 ; A. Pelzer, *Les 51 articles de G. d'O. censurés à Avignon en /326,* in *Rev. hist. Eccl.,* 1922, p. 240-270.

[4] This term signified a bachelor at Oxford. Hence the title of *Venerabilis inceptor* given to Ockham by his admirers. He was never a doctor or master of theology.

[5] Cf. A. Pelzer, *op. cit.* This was simply a censure emitted by a papal commission, the usual forerunner of a papal condemnation. The latter was never actually made.

manifestos x. He was excommunicated in 1328 and did not seek reconciliation until after the death of Louis of Bavaria (1347) nor is it certain that he was relieved of the censures he had incurred: he died about 1349.

Ockham's influence was disastrous enough in ecclesiastical matters[2]; in philosophy it proved even more deadly. The latter took the form of a violent reaction against the old scholasticism and was not without a far-reaching effect on theology. As a Franciscan, Ockham must have been trained in the principles of Scotus[3], but these he rejected for the most part, and disfigured what remained. The basic idea of his philosophy seems to have been suggested to him by the Oxford masters who preferred to dabble in purely physical or mathematical sciences[4]. And it is a fact that in his teaching, the concrete, the singular, and the individual achieve a preponderating importance, thus constituting a true philosophical revolution.

Ockham's ideological system has been called *nominalism* or *tenninism.* With greater precision it should be termed Occamism, for it differs from that of the early nominalists (verbalists) of the Xlth century for whom the universal was no more than an unmeaning word *(flatus vocis)* and also from that of modern empiricists who consider it as merely a sensation. For Ockham it retained all its ideal value; it is a sign, a pure creation of the mind, lacking all reality: it is the object of abstract knowledge; the knowledge of the ideal or unreal. Only the individual is real, and is apprehended, even intellectually, by *intuition.* There exists no active intellect nor intellectual species: the object itself is perceived by intuition and the idea is its sign.

Metaphysics is thus brought low, deprived of its peculiar object, the universal, a pure mental production. In addition, it is simplified by means of the principle: "Non sunt multiplicanda entia sine necessitate". Reacting against the formalities of Scotus, Ockham rejects the majority of the real as well as formal distinctions that were admitted by earlier writers: he retains substance, but confuses it with the accidents, either with quantity (identified with extension) or with the qualities. The soul is not distinct from its faculties and essence is the same as existence. Matter, however, is not confused with the form. Indeed, in certain beings, man for instance, there is a plurality of substantial forms (three main ones)[5].

Ockham's logic was enriched by the spoils *of* metaphysics. "What is declared to be illusory in the world of reality becomes matter for dialectical combinations... Ockham accentuates the purely formal

[1] *Dialoçus: opus nonaginta dierum; Compendium errorum Joannis fap? XXII; Quastiones VIII de auctoritate summi pontificis. De imperatorum (t pontificum potestate* (ed. MULDER, 1924, BRAMPTON, 1927).

[2] See below, p. 677 sq. — [3] He was not, however, his pupil.

[4] See above, p. 494. — [5] Form of the body, sensitive soul, intellectual soul.

side of logic, which he calls *omnium artium aptissimum instrumentum*... Mental acrobatics became a kind of game practised by the disciples of the *venerabilis inceptor* with more skill than their master [1]. Yet these dialectical exercises were meaningless. Ockam denied the power of reason in a number of demonstrations; that of the spirituality of the soul, for instance, and even for the existence of God.

This psychology, so badly crippled as regards the theory of knowledge, went to the other extreme in all that concerns the will. "Ockham professed the most complete *voluntarism*. The will is independent of intellectual representations of the good. How can our *real* conduct be affected by combinations of *concepts* concerning the end, the means, and morality, i. e., by a set of symbols created by the mind? The will is granted an absolute power of self-determination, decision freed from reasonable motives, and the spontaneous act confused with the free act"[2]. The act of willing is the very essence of the soul; in consequence its act is always free; but it cannot know good or evil except by revelation, for what is good depends entirely on the will of God.

Ockham's partial agnosticism was somewhat tempered by his supernatural theology [3] whose limits he enlarged by attributing to it a great deal of what he had taken from reason. According to him, the spirituality of the soul and its immortality, the existence and attributes of God, can be known only by faith. Yet on the other hand Ockham's theories "make even faith impossible by reason of the denials with which it is riddled: for after all, if there is nothing real in relations how can we explain the mystery of the Blessed Trinity in which subsisting relations constitute the divine Persons? If personality is no more than a negative modality, and if neither the existence nor the subsistence of the Word are real entities, dominating and possessing the human nature of the Saviour by taking the place of human existence and subsistence, how can we avoid the error of Nestorius who perceived only the duality of natures in Christ? And if the accident does not really differ from the substance and is not separable from it, how can we state, much less explain, the mystery of transubstantiation?" [4]. Ockham has a ready reply to all this: the will of God; but that does not advance us at all, since it is precisely this will we have to explain, in the measure that is possible. Ockham's constant invocation of God's absolute "power" finally gives the impression of something

[1] M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. niéd.*, II, p. 158, 172, 174.

[3] Having repudiated metaphysics, Ockham had to abandon natural theology. This he did by appealing to faith. He avoided absolute scepticism, but fell into fideism. — [2] L. Maiiieu, *op. cit.*, p. 497-49S. — [4] L. Mahieu, *op. cit.*, p. 497-49S.

arbitrary and tyrannical, quite incompatible with His infinite wisdom and goodness [*]. The theological teaching that seeks congruent reasons in keeping with these great attributes is far more fertile in its conclusions!

The consequences of these principles are found throughout all Ockham's theology and even in his moral teaching. There exists neither good nor evil z/z *se:* both depend *solely* on the will of God, Who could have decreed the contrary[1]. It follows that the commands of natural law possess no value unless faith reveals them to have been positively decreed by God. Ockham asserts that this development of God's will, lar from lessening the power of the human will, has a contrary effect. *Human acts,* even those that are purely natural, could merit eternal salvation, had God so willed. And in reality "we pave the way for grace by purely natural acts, nor is it impossible that some of these are good, in spite of original sin ; the latter, indeed, merely affects our lower powers. Without the aid of grace, even though Adam fell, we are able to obey all the ten commandments and even love God above all things, not perhaps as regards the way of loving Him (since supernatural love is obligatory in view of glory) but at least as regards the substance of the act" [3][4]. Thus did Ockham introduce a new Semipelagianism.

These few remarks should be enough to show how deadly was the impact of Ockham's teaching in the doctrinal order. On the one hand, almost complete suppression of metaphysics, of natural theology and even theological speculation in the true meaning of the word; on the other hand a purely verbal and excessive dialectic with a definite tendency to sophistry. The contemptuous criticism of early writers achieved for it a superficial appearance of superiority and it was to this, as much as to its partial scepticism that Ockhams doctrine owed its pernicious infiltration. It ushered in the *via modernorum* or *via moderna* to be opposed henceforth to the old scholasticism, the *via antiqua* or *antiquorum.*

The influence of this teaching is to be measured by its rapid propagation[4]. In the universities and especially in the faculties of arts it found warm admirers who, in their turn, made it more widely known. It first saw the light at Oxford where it soon gained " not perhaps a monopoly, but certainly a preponderating part " [5]. Paris also gave a warm welcome to the new teaching, which, despite the vigilance of the academical authorities, found resolute protagonists even among the highest-placed dignitaries.

1 Sec above, p. 654.

' An exact affirmation for a number of positive precepts, but extremely rash as regards all good and all evil.

3 L. Mahieu, *op. cit.,* p. 9.

4 M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. mid.,* 11, p. 174-192.

5 *l^'d.,* p. 175.

John Buridan[1] (d. about 1358) rector in 1328 and 1340, did all he could to introduce it into the university. *Marsile of Inghem*[2], his pupil, and also rector (1367-1371) continued his work. In 1374 a defence of the *via moderna* of the *doctissimi viri Nominales* was contained in a manifesto by the Parisian masters. *Pierre d'Ailly* (1350-1420) future Archbishop of Cambrai, doctor in 1380 and chancellor in 1389, was imbued with the revolutionary teaching and even *John Gerson* suffered its influence[3]. It spread in a similar fashion through the other universities that were founded in the XIVth century, in spite of the opposition it usually encountered from the theological faculties. Even the *religious orders* were contaminated, though they appear to have put up a firmer resistance. Under Pope John XXII in 1326, many of Ockham's propositions were condemned. In 1346, Clement VI denounced to the theologians of Paris "the strange sophistic doctrines" of the Occamists and condemned[4] them. These authoritative pronouncements, however, had but little effect and theology continued to suffer from this new tendency that made itself felt in every centre of studies.

The errors of Wyclif and John Huss cannot of course be likened to Ockham's teaching[5], though their diffusion was in a large measure due to the invading tide of nominalism and the confusion it left in its paths. Ockham's scandalous revolt paved the way for Wyclif (1324-1384) when he defended the claims of his sovereign against the popes. As the king's chaplain and a master of theology at Oxford, Wyclif set himself up with revolutionary boldness as the

[1] John Buridan of Bethune, author of several commentaries on Aristotle, stressed voluntarism to the point of determinism and as an illustration of this doctrine was conceived (either by himself, his followers, or his opponents) the simile of an ass which, placed between two bales of hay, let itself die of hunger. M. de Wulf, *ibid.*, p. 179-180.

[2] Marsile of Inghem (d. about 1395) at a later date taught Ockham's doctrine at Heidelburg where he was the first rector (1386).

[3] For P. d'Ailly and Gerson see below, p. 687.

[4] In 1346 and 1347. These condemnations were aimed at Nicholas of Autrecourt, a secular priest, and John of Mirecourt, Cistercian, both Occamists. Cf. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.*, 11, p. 223-229. Another Oxford Occamist, the future Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Bradwardine (d. 1349) created a strictly determinist system that suppressed all liberty. *Ibid.*, p. 220-222. Thus Bradwardine and the two preceding writers whom he influenced, broke away from Ockham's doctrinal guidance (Semipelagian) and embraced fatalism, which they erroneously claimed to be St. Augustine's. L. Mahieu, p. 12. —[5] Cf. L. Mahieu, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

reformer of religion in every domain. He macle the Church subject to the State. Yet strangely enough he would have had it wholly spiritual, without a hierarchy, almost without sacraments, and without the Eucharistic Presence. He preached austerity but combated the religious who practised it. In the steps of Bradwardine he denied liberty[1], and fell into predestinationism. His errors were condemned by the English episcopacy (1382) but he refused to retract and persisted in his teaching. Before long it found its way to central Europe where it was eagerly seized upon by John HUSS (1369-1415) professor at Prague (1398) and rector of the university (1402) who turned it to his use in his revolt against the Church and his campaign to free the Slav province of Bohemia from the German oppression of the Empire. He was condemned at Constance[2].

II. THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS.

A). Franciscans.

The Franciscan Order, in spite of internal troubles[3], continued to give proof of vigorous intellectual interests throughout the xivth century and more particularly at its outset. Its theologians for the most part professed the Scotist teaching, although Scotus had not then been adopted as the official doctor of the Order[4] and there was a good deal of opposition to his teaching at the time. In any case the Franciscan commentators of Lombard's Sentences went for their inspiration to the principles laid down by the Subtle Doctor, and even attempted to improve on his subtility by multiplying entities and formalities. To this excessive Scotism is partly due the reaction of the Occamist party.

The most famous of the Scotist Sententiarii[5] in the xivth century was Francis of Meyronnes (d. 1325)[6] who earned for himself the significant title of " magister acutus abstractionum". We may also

[1] In this he was more logical than Ockham who glorified the will after having cried down the intelligence. All Protestantism was latent in Wyclif.

[3] See in the *Enchir. symb.*, Denzinger (n. 581-689) the condemned errors of Wyclif and John Huss. Huss was an anti-nominalist, but it was his theology and not his philosophy that was condemned.

[3] Chiefly the revolt of the spirituals. See below, p. 692.

[4] This title was given him in 1593 by a general chapter held at Valladolid. Fr. Ehrif. *{op. cit.*, note 6). —[5] See Hurter, *op. cit.*, vol. 11, p. 521 sq.

[6] The foundation of the *actus sorbonicus* was ascribed to him. There are no grounds for this attribution.

mention John of Reading master at Oxford at the beginning of the Xivth century; JOHN OF Bassolis (d. 1347), the favourite pupil of Scotus; Peter of Aquila (1348) called *Scotellus* on account of his excellent *Scotist Compendium.* Several of Scotus' pupils wrote works that were attributed to their master: such is the *Metaphysica textualis* by Antonius Andre.e (about 1320). Others defended the purity of the School's teaching against Ockham's negations : such as Walter Burleigh (d. after 1342) and Walter of Catton (d. about 1343).

Yet Scotus did not entirely overshadow St. Bonaventure, as is proved particularly by the works of Alexander of Alexandria (d. 1314) and especially by those of John of Erfurt (about 1350). A *Compendium* of sentences, Bonaventuran in tone, is attributed to John Fontaine, a lector at Montpellier. Another Compendium, extracts from St. Bonaventure's Breviloquium, was used by John Rigaud (d. 1388), Bishop of Treguier, in his *Compendium theologia pauperis.* — Many Franciscan theologians dealt with poverty. Among those who did not altogether avoid exaggeration was Denys Foullechat several of whose propositions were condemned by Urban V. He retracted them publicly2.

All these authors remained loyal to the realist tradition (together with the Thomists they were called *reales')* and firmly resisted the nominalist flood. At the end of the century, the Franciscan, Peter OF Candía 3, a master at Paris about 1381, bishop in 1386, named pope *{Alexander V)* by the Council of Pisa, represented, from a doctrinal viewpoint, "a Scotism tinged with Nominalism "4.*

Since Ockham's teaching· first saw the light in the Franciscan Order it naturally found followers there. But they were not the majority. Ockham had a *forerunner* in the person of Peter Auriol 5 (d. 1322) Scotus' pupil at Paris, master of theology, provincial of Aquitania, Archbishop of Aix (1321). He created a new kind of conceptualism aimed at Thomism and Scotism. This ingenious doctrine was adopted and completed by Ockham. — Among Ockham's *first pupils* 6 must be mentioned ÀDAM WODEHAN (d. 1358) a master at Oxford, where he commented the Sentences in 1332. Brinkel imitated him towards the end of the century. Other Franciscans, enamoured of Ockham, taught on the continent; such for instance as John of Ripa who

' E. Longpré, */. de It. et te βχ D. Scot,* in *Francefranc.*, 1924, p. 99 sq.

3 Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion,* n. 575-577.

3 Eh RLE, *Der Scntenzenkonimentar Peter v. Candía.* Munster, 1925.

4 M. de Wulf, *Hist. ph. mid..* 11, p. 185 (according to Ehrle). Cf. *ibid..* p. 183-185. For Alexander V, see J. Sai.embier, *op. cit..* p. 264 sq.

3 For his life, sec N. Valois, *P. Auriol.* in *Hist. lilt, de la France,* vol. 33 (1901); for his teaching, R. Dreiling, *Der Konzeptualismus... des P. Aurioli* (Bcitràge), Münster, 1913. Cf. M. de Wulf, *op. cit..* p. 161-163.

6Cf. Ehrle, *ot>. cit.* See other names in *Did. thiol.,* art. *Frères Mineurs.* col. 831.

taught at Paris in 1357 a doctrine akin to that of John of Mirecourt

One of the glories of Franciscan theology is to have defended and accomplished the triumph of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary[1]. The teaching of the Order on this dogma became general during the xivth century. At the outset, several theologians still remained loyal to St Bonaventure's teaching; but under the influence of Duns Scotus the new teaching rapidly gained ground. It produced notable apologists: Peter of Auriol devoted a little treatise to it *(De conceptione immaculata Virginis,* 1314) soon followed by another apologetical work *(Repercussorium);* at the same period Francis of Meyrolles composed a *Tractatus de conceptione B. M. V.* Others are known. Carefully tended by these masters the pious belief rooted itself firmly within the Order; at the end of the XIVth century it held undisputed sway. At the University of Paris, which allowed the holders of both opinions to explain their doctrine, the Franciscans invariab y championed Mary's privilege. A Spanish Franciscan, JOHN Vit a l about 1387 wrote a *Defensorium B. M. V.,* against the outrageous theses of the Dominican, John of Monzons (a native of Aragon): 14 propositions incurred the censure of the university. The Pope, (Clement VII, of Avignon) made no pronouncement, but the Dominicans, in order to resume their teaching in the University, were obliged to give up these opinions[4].

B). Dominicans[5].

At the beginning of the xivth century (1309) the Preaching Friars adopted St. Thomas' teaching as the official doctrine of the Order, and successive general chapters often reminded backsliders of this fact. In consequence, the majority of Dominican theologians professed Thomism.. Some undertook its *defence,* for there were still adversaries, though

1 See above, p. 667.

3 P.-X. Le Bachelet, *Immaculée Conception,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1078-10SS.

* *Ibid., co*\. 1083 sq. Blessed Raymond Lulle's doctrine of the immaculate conception was combated in Spain by another Dominican from Aragon, N. Eymeric, at the end of the xivth century. *Ibid.,* col. 10SS-10S9. For R. Lulle, (see above, p. 495).

4 Mandonnet, *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 900.

5 *Ibid.,* col. 894-905; M. de Wulf, *Hist, de la phil. méd.,* 11, p. 176, 181, 197-200.

the approval given by the Council of Vienna (1311) to the great thesis of the unity of the substantial form which had been so fiercely resisted by the Augustinians, gave it a great advantage,

Among the defenders who continued the work of the authors of the *corredarla* were: Thomas of Jorz (d. 1310) master at Oxford, provincial, cardinal and author of a *Liber propugnatiorius... contra Scolimi* (on the first book of Sentences); the Breton, Hervé of Nedellec or Natalis (d. 1323) general of the order in 1318, author of commentaries on the Sentences and of a *Defensa Doctrina: d. Thornee,* a defence of Thomism based on the Summa, foreshadowing that of Capreolus. In addition he refuted Henry of Gand and Durandus of St. Pourçain. The latter was also particularly attacked by his namesake Durandus of Aurillac called Durandel (d. 1380). The Thomist theologians commented the Sentences in the schools but they made use of St. Thomas' writings as ancillary works and it was in order to make access to these more easy that *abridged versions* of the Summa were composed at the outset of the XIVth century: that of John Dominici was written a little after 1323.

The first Thomist concordances were also composed at the beginning of this century. They were intended to explain and conciliate the divergent assertions that are to be found in the commentaries on the Sentences and in the Summa: the first are those of Benedict of Assignano, future Bishop of Como (d. 1339) and Thomas Sutton ', one of St. Thomas' most enthusiastic defenders at the beginning of the XIVth century. Finally, towards 1350-1360, Hervé de la Queue drew up the first table of contents, which in later centuries was to be used by those who composed the general Index of all St. Thomas' works.

A number of Dominican masters were false to Thomism. And in the forefront comes DURANDUS OF St. POURÇAIN [2] (d. 1334) who taught at Paris, then at the papal court in Avignon (1313) before becoming bishop (of Limoux, 1317, Puy, 1318, Meaux, 1326). He was an anti-realist, rejecting the intentional species and the active intellect and considering universals as pure creations of the mind. His conceptualism was rejected by several chapters of the Order, but was taught in a few universities and paved the way for Ockham [3]. Among the Dominicans who allowed

'According to Mandonnet *(Ecrits auth.,* p. 156) his concordance is that which is edited among the works *(opuscula)* of St. Thomas. Vives cd., vol. 28, p. 569 sq. ; Parma ed., vol. 17, p. 407 sq. For Thomas Sutton, see M. de Wulf, *Hist. ph. mid.,* 11, p. 44-47.

[2] J. Koch, *Durandus de S.-l'., (Beitriige),* Münster, 1927. Cf. Mandonnet, in *Bulletin thorn.*, 1928, p. [349H355]. See also M. de Wulf, *op. at.,* π, p. 159-161.

[3] The famous Peter Paludanus (d. 1342), glory of the Dominican Order in the XIVth century, doctor at Paris, Patriarch of Jerusalem, was one of the

themselves to be led astray in a greater or lesser degree by Occamism was Armand of Beauvoir (d. about 1340) Master of the Sacred Palace, and the Englishman ROBERT HOLCOT (d. 1349), master at Cambridge, who is supposed to have taught determinism even before Bradwardine[1]. These and a number of other theologians were outstanding exceptions among the Dominican teachers, who, for the most part, were decided Thomists.

C) Augustinians.

The Hermits of St. Augustine combined with their very real veneration for the Bishop of Hippo a sincere though moderate loyalty to Thomist teaching, in keeping with the example given them by Ægidius Romanus. This *Ægidian School* enjoyed a certain popularity in the XIVth century[2]. In two main branches of learning it produced noteworthy works: in defence of the rights of the Church, and on moral and ascetic questions. The first treatise on Ecclesiology[3], indeed, was written by JAMES OF VITERBO, a pupil of Ægidius, who died before him[4]. Better known is Augustinus Triumphus (1243-1328) author of a *Summa de potestate ecclesiastica* (1320), dedicated to Pope John XXII[5]. An Italian by birth (Ancona) he was a doctor at Paris where he attended St. Thomas' lectures. In 1274 he was summoned to the Council of Lyons, there to take the place of St. Thomas, it is said. A counsellor of princes and popes, he nevertheless found time for writing and has left treatises on the most varied subjects: *De cognitione anima; Super Missus est; De salutatione angelica; Novella de I7 et VI decretalibus;* etc... Many other writings are extant[6]:

censors of Durandus' teaching. Later, in 1337, he was one of those who addressed respectful remonstrances to John XXII regarding the "personal" opinion the latter had put forward on the retarding of the beatific vision (*Chart. Univ, par.,* II, 429-431). The pope retracted this before he died (*ibid.,* 440-442). For all this question, see X. le Bachelet, *Benoît XII,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 657-696. He showed equal courage in defending the rights of the Holy See: *De causa inimediata ecclesiastica potestatis.*

[1] Mandonnet however does not think that Holcot's Occamism is proved. *Diet, thiol.,* art. *Frères Prêcheurs,* col. 898.

[2] See above, p. 640. — [3] See above, p. 683.

[4] See below, p. 682. In addition to the works mentioned on p. 661, see U. Mariani, O. S. A., *Biografia di B. di Viterbo,* in *Archivio d. soc. rom. di storia pat.,* 1926, p. 137 sq.; and 2 articles in *Giornale dantesco,* 1925 and 1926.

[5] See below, p. 6S3. — [6] Nearly all in manuscript.

commentaries on Aristotle's *Metaphysics,* the Books of *Sentences,* the New Testament, and an attempted synthesis of St. Augustine's teaching *(Milleloquium).* None of these had the same vogue and importance as his above-mentioned *Summa* in which, towards the end of his life, he courageously attacked the ecclesiastical problems of the time.

Another Augustinian, Henry of Friemar (in Thuringia) who died about 1340, was a Parisian doctor and a master in various German cities before becoming provincial. His piety earned him the name of *Doctor Seraphicus;* he wrote dogmatic works *(Additiones ad libros Sententiarum;* treatise *Pro Conceptione B. V. Marico)* and mainly moral works *(De quatuor instinctibus; De spiritibus eorunique discretione; Expositio trimaria decem preeeeptorum; Passio D. N. explanata)* and sermons. This pious author was used to say: I speak to God in prayer, but it is He who speaks to me in study 1.

The most outstanding of the doctors of the Ægidian School in the middle of the XIVth century was the Alsatian Thomas of Strasburg (d. 1357) who taught brilliantly in that town before becoming General of the Order in 1345.

Gregory of Rimini[2] (d. 1358) his successor, who survived him by little, is said to have caused a doctrinal split in the Order by favouring *Occamism.* There is no doubt that as a student in Paris about 1324 he had embraced the most characteristic ideological principles and it was perhaps he who was forbidden to teach Ockham's logic and hold his opinions, by the Chapter of 1348 held at Pavia. Yet he would certainly not have been elected General had he not obeyed this decree which was never recalled, nor would the pope have called him *Doctor authenticus* [3].

A number of other Augustinians in the XIVth century had the same tendencies: Hugolinus of Orvieto, called Malebranca (d. 1374) general in 1368; a Parisian master, who gave statutes to the University of Bologna; John OF BALE (d. 1392) another Parisian doctor and also general, whose commentaries on the Sentences, written before he became a master, are extant. Like Hugolinus, the latter absolutely rejected determinism[4]. The Thomism of the Augustinian masters was too elastic to render them immune from the dangers of Parisian philosophical teaching, riddled as it was with Occamism, and no matter how attached

1 Inter orandum solebat dicere, Deo se loqui, inter studendum Deuni sibi. Hurter, *op. cit.,* π, 541-542. Other authors mentioned, *ibid.*

*N. Merlin, *Grégoire de Rimini,* in *Did. thiol.,* 1852-1854.— M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. méd.,* π, p. 182.

3 He was also termed *tortor paivulorum* either because of his upholding Augustine's personal opinions (suchas the damnation of children; see above, p. 667) or by punning on his family name, Tortoricci.

4 Of John of Mirecourt and Bradwardine.

they were to the Augustinian doctrine it was not potent enough to preserve them

D) Other Religious.

I. Carmelites[1]. The Order of Carmelites who, with the XVUth century theologians of Salamanca *(Salmanticenses),* were to profess an unalloyed Thomism, showed signs of hesitation at the outset. According to De Wulf, one of the principles of its first masters appears to have been eclecticism. A first example was given by Gerard of Bologna[3], a master at Paris in 1295. Though following St. Thomas for the most part, he sided with Scotus on the question of universals[4]; yet he rejected the formal distinction and the admixture of matter in spirits, just as he denied theThomist distinction of essence and existence and individuation by matter.

A similar eclecticism is found in the writings of Guy Terré (d. 1342) despite his joy at St. Thomas' canonisation. He was general of his Order. It is still more apparent in Sibert OF Beck (cl. 1332), who was provincial of Cologne, and Paul of Perugia (d. 1344, master at Paris in 1339).

It would seem that accusations of Averroism brought against Baconthorpes or John Bacon (d. 1346) a friend of Bradwardine, are unfounded. He seems to have been an independent thinker who made Auriol his main object of attack. Though giving allegiance to no school, he preferred St. Thomas. His namesake, FRANCIS BACON (d. after 1372), who commented the Sentences at Paris about 1360, had a leaning for Nominalism, a teaching with which his colleague, JOHN Brammart (d. 1407) was wholly imbued.

2. Cistercians. The Cistercian Order does not seem to have taken a very active part in the quarrels of the Schools in the Xivth century. John of Mirecourt[6] cannot be said to represent the Order. Its real spokesmen seem to have been Wyclif's opponents in England : Adam, Abbot of Rewley, near Oxford (d. after 1368) who wrote various treatises : *De cavendo ab haresi; De ordine monastico; Dialogus rationis et animai;* Henry Crump (d. after 1382) who composed *Determina·*

1 It has been said of the Augustinian masters that they were "jurantes in verba S. Augustini". Such servility is not without its perils.

2 See B. XIBERTA, brief monographs in *Analecta Ordìms Carmelitarum.* 1926 and sq. ; and in *Critesion,* 1925. Cf. G. Théry, in *Rev. sc. ph. th.,* 1926, p. 262 sq. and 1928, p. 307 sq. M. de Wulf, *Hist. ph. mid.,* 11, p. 203, 206, 219. — 3 See above, p. 639.

4 P. Servais, *Gérard de 13.,* in *Did. th.,* col. 1289.

5 See M. de Wulf, *ibid.,* p. 219. — 6 See above, p. 667, n. 4.

1 J. Besse, *Cisterciens,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 2540.

Hones scholastical. The important part played by the Cistercians in medieval spirituality will be discussed in the following chapter.

E) Seculars.

As we have already mentioned, all the universities in the Xivth century allowed themselves to be corrupted by Occamism. Especially did the secular masters fall under its sway, even the best of them, such as Pierre d'Ailly and John Gerson, who, in their time, were regarded as great doctors. Since their work is very varied and particularly reminiscent of contemporary ecclesiastical controversies it will be treated below[2]. Before them lived a number of less reliable secular masters whose work often deserved condemnation and which was in fact often condemned by the Church.

John of Pouilly, a Parisian master at the beginning of the century, very hostile to the Mendicants — for which be was condemned by John XXII[3] — generally followed St. Thomas in theology and philosophy, though his eclectic tastes sometimes made him look to Godefrey of Fontaines and even Ockham [4].

John of **Jandun**[5] (Ardennes) was the outstanding protagonist of Averroism in France in the xivth century. A Master of Arts and Theology he commented Aristotle in a most anti-Christian and Averroist sense. Yet he declared that he had not lost the faith which is able to dedare true what reason sees as false, and reciprocally. Being involved in the fall of Marsilius of Padua he went to Germany in 1326 to beg the support of Louis of Bavaria and place himself at his service. He obtained from him the See of Ferrara, but died about the same time (1328).

Marsilius of **Padua**[6] (d. about 1327) a native of that town, where he was named canon in 1316 by John XXII, was Rector of the University of Paris in 1312-1313. He is chiefly remembered for his revolt against John XXII, and his schismatical theories, for which he was excommunicated, together with John of Jandun, on the 13th October 1327[7]. He was named Archbishop of Milan by Louis of Bavaria but never took possession of his see, as Louis was forced to leave Italy. His literary work will be studied in the following paragraph.

Another Parisian doctor, Nicholas of Autrecourt maintained philosophical propositions dangerous to the faith : sixty-one of these were condemned by Clement \ZI in 1346[8].

[1] *Ibid.* —[2] See p. 687. —[3] Denzinger-B., *Eneh. Symb.,* n. 491-493.

[4] See Thouvenin, *Jean de P.,* in *Diet, théol.·,* col. 797-799. N. Valois, in Zfw/. *Utt. Fr.,* vol. 34, p. 220-281.

[5] J. Rivière, y. *de. Jandun,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 764-765. N. Valois, *Hist. Hit. Fr.,* vol. 33, p. 528-633. M. de Wulf, *oj>. cit.,* 11, p. 216-219.

[6] J. Rivière, *Marsile de Padove,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 153-177. N. Valois, in *Hist. lilt. Fr.,* vol. 33, 528-623.

[7] Denzinger-B., *Ench. Symb.,* n. 495-500. — [8] */bid.,* n. 553-570.

Apart from these wayward doctors many others remained orthodox though still leaning to a certain eclecticism, such as Thomas de Bailly, Parisian chancellor (d. 1328). The determinisi Thomas Bradwardine, Archbishop of Canterbury has already been mentioned [1].

III. THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH.

A). The relations of Church and State.

I. It was mainly towards the end of the Middle Ages that theologians systematised their teaching on the origin, the nature, and the extent of the power of the Church. This was occasioned in a large measure by the troubles of the time, and the relations of Church and State was the first point that occupied their labours. Although long theoretical treatises had not then been written, there existed a traditional doctrine reduced to a few principles to which popes and doctors appealed and which were commonly accepted. First of all, *the distinction of the tzvo powers,* spiritual and temporal, was clearly admitted. Following in the traces of Saint Ambrose, St. Augustine[2] and Pope Gelasius [3], Nicholas I had affirmed it in the IXth century : according to the will of Christ there are two distinct authorities in two special domains, each having its own privileges [4]. The popes who followed did not dispute this assertion, but from the time of Gregory VII particularly, they preferred to stress another principle : the *subordination 0/ the temporal to the spiritual power,* as the body is subject to the soul [5]. This subordination implied a real authority, symbolised by the sword; hence the famous expression by which St. Bernard gives to the Church a double sword, one spiritual and one temporal, the former is drawn *by* the Church, and the latter *in her defence* and at her instance[6]. Boniface VIII again used the

1 See above, p. 667, Bradwardine was neither a Dominican nor a Franciscan, as some have supposed.

2 Cf. vol. I, p. 523 and 688.

3 Cf. above, p. 144.

4 Ep. 86; *P. L.,* 119, 960.

5 Tanto sunt (spiritualia) temporalibus digniora, quanto corpori est anima præferenda. Innocent III, *Decret. P. L.,* 216, 1183. Cf. *Sum. théol.,* na-n®, q. 60. a. 6 ad 3 (according to Greg, of Naz.).

6 Uterque ergo Ecclesiæ, et spiritalis scilicet gladius et materialis; sed is quidem *pro* Ecclesia, ille vero et *ab* Ecclesia exerendus. *De Consid.,* iv, 3, 7; *P. L.,* 182, 776. The comparison was classical from the ixth cent. For St. Bernard's opinion see J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 405-423.

comparison in the famous Bull *Unam sanctam* (18th Nov. 1302) which officially promulgated the traditional teaching on this question L

Considered in its essential elements this doctrine corresponds to what is now termed the indirect power of the spiritual over the temporal: it is in the real meaning of the term, a true power able to impose obedience3; but it is no more than indirect, and its purpose is to defend morality and religion: the Church intervenes in temporal affairs *"ratione peccati"* 4.* This last expression was admitted by Innocent IV himself, while the word *indirect* is due to an earlier canonist writing about 1216 s. It must nevertheless be confessed that this thesis did not become current in the Church until a very advanced date, although the substance of it is to be found in St. Thomas6. And at that time it was not sufficiently isolated from other secondary conceptions that were combined with it7 and which for some period discredited it or at least obscured its importance in the eyes of the best doctors.

The violent opposition that met the bulls of Boniface Vili, especially the *Unatn sanctam* is well known. And it has been conjectured that the theory of indirect power was exceeded in the doctrinal decrees, by the preambles that accompanied them : rightly or wrongly these have been considered as insinuating the thesis of *direct power*,* tending to lessen the civil power to the advantage of religious authority,

'Denzinger-B., *Ench.,* n. 468-469. Abstract in J. Rivière, *Le problème de l'Eglise et de l'Etat an temps de Philippe le Bel.* Louvain-Taris, 1926, p. 79-91. " Nothing essentially new, of course, is found in the first half of the Bull, which consists of pure dogma: the unity of the Church and the necessity of belonging to it... ; the primacy of the Roman Pontiff... As regards the powers of the Church, explained in the second half of the Bull, not only the matter but also the style is borrowed from early authors... The dogmatic definition that brings the document to an end is no other than an expression from St. Thomas *(Coni. err. Grcec.,* II, 27) ". *Ibid.,* p. 87-88.

3 The temporal is here opposed to the *spiritual,* directly subjected to the plenary power of the Church, and to the *mixed,* directly subjected on the one hand to the Church and on the other to the State. The temporal, of itself, is subject to the Stale alone; but indirectly, *ratione peccati,* it also falls under the jurisdiction of the Church.

3 Which distinguishes this teaching from the theory of guiding authority.

4 The formula of the *Codex:* " Ecclesia jure proprio et exclusivo cognoscit 2. De violatione legum ecclesiasticarum deque *omnibus* in quibus inest *ratione pacati".* *Codex,* c. 1553, par. 1, 2.

5 With reference to the words of Innocent III: " *Non enim intendimus judicare de fundo,* " the canonist Vincent the Spaniard adds: " *Directe;* sed *indirecte,* cognoscendo an peccet".—"Ergo Papa de temporali se jurisdictione non debet intromittere, nisi indirecte ratione peccati ". J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* P. 54.

6 Ch. JOURNET, *La pensée thomiste sur le "pouvoir indirect",* in *vie intellectuelle,* April, 1929, p. 630-682; see p. 645-655.

7 Under the influence of the political and social regime established in the Middle Ages.

8 J. Riviere's opinion *(op. cit.,* p. 89 sq.) against J. de la Servière, *(Boniface VIII,* in *Diet. Ap.,* col. 430).

a teaching that is clearly erroneous. This theory is met with in the works of several defenders of the papacy in the XIVth century, and it is supposed to go back as far as Gregory VII [1] or at least to his followers. Though it is uncertain that the pope and his friends took up this excessive attitude[2], there is no doubt that their opponents proclaimed the divine right of kings. They were the distant forerunners of the legists, who in the XIVth century started the revolt against the pontifical power, first in France, then in Germany, fostered in the former country by *Philip the Fair* (1285-1314) and in the latter by *Louis of Bavaria* (1314-1347). Their upheavals unsettled the Church not only under Boniface VIII and John XXII but for a long time afterwards.

2. The distant echoes of these controversies derived from their doctrinal nature. Theologians, philosophers and jurists put their learning in the service of the princes. Several writings developing their teaching are extant [3], They contain noteworthy shades of difference.

Of the FOUR ANONYMOUS TREATISES of Frendi origin that date from the beginning of the controversy two contain marked regal tendencies: 1. *The Dialogue between a clerk and a knight*[4] (about 1302) "combats ecclesiastical absolutism" in order to put "that of the civil power in its place". At bottom it seeks the subjection of the Church to the State, giving to the latter the right of using, controlling and guiding the moral force for which it stands. The end that is envisaged is the public and national interest, which the State alone should administer by means of a despotism that is superior to all laws [5]. 2. The treatise called *Bex facificus* [6] sets out a similar teaching but with "greater philosophical trappings in systematised form". At first sight the simile of the head (Church) and the heart (State) which is developed at length seems to lead to a simple distinction of the powers: but it soon becomes obvious that the author admits an affective superiority of the civil power and even endeavours to base his contention on the Scriptures.

A more moderate teaching is found in the two other contemporary documents: the first, entitled *Qucestio in utramque/artem lf\s Á sdhtï* and rigorous theological dissertation intended to establish that "the two powers come from God and are essentially distinct; the ordinary authority of the Church is limited to the spiritual order"; it nevertheless possesses a certain superiority, particularised by the

[1] J. Rivière, *op. at.*, p. 9-13.

[2] VOOSEN, *Papauté et pouvoir civil à l'époque de Grégoire VII.* Louvain, 1927. This author speaks chiefly of the "pre-eminence of the Church", of "the superiority of the ecclesiastical power over the civil power" (pp. 224, n. 3).

[3] Riviere devotes the greater part of his book to a thorough study of these writings and the contrary theses of the pope's defenders.

[4] J- Rivière, *op. nt.*, p. 129-130 and 253-261 (summary). —[5] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

[6] These words are the *incipit.* The real title is *Quastio de potestate papa.* Cf. J. Rivière, *op. at.*, p. 135*13^ and 262-271 (summary).

[7] ctt" P· *33·*35 and 272-281 (summary).

author, but this in no way is prejudicial to the State'. The second, an anonymous *gloss*[2] on the Bull *Unam sanctam* contains an almost similar teaching[3].

The most outstanding representative of this tempered conception of the relations between Church and State was the Dominican, John Quidorti, author of the notable treatise *De potestate regia et papali*[5]. An independent and vigorous theologian, he gave allegiance to no faction; he maintained a position midway between that of the Waldensians who denied to the Church all intervention in temporal things, and that of those who advocated the direct power. lie regarded the possession of temporal wealth by the Church as lawful, though it is conceded by the prince. The two societies are clearly distinct: the difference of their ends entails the distinction of government and its peculiar functions. There is but one spiritual authority for all mankind, but a universal political monarchy is inadmissible. The two societies should collaborate under the *moral guidance of the Church,* which, however, should influence the conscience of the ruler rather than the State as such. A fairly marked nationalist tendency permeates all these arguments and it is emphasised by several theories in which some authors perceive a latent gallicanism: i. e., deposition of unworthy popes, at least the suggestion of the superior authority of councils, and a number of others.

John Quidort's position in France was very' similar to that which Dante[6][7] the great medieval Christian poet adopted with regard to the Empire in his *De monarchia*[7] (about 1311). With wholly scholastic severity' he first establishes the independence of the empire by means of arguments taken from reason and the Scriptures, and aspires

1 \et the author's patriotism attains to a kind of veneration for France and the old dynasty and reveals him to be " well on the road to Gallicanism ". *Ibid.,* p. 279.

2 *Ibid.,*\>. 153'155· The author opposes it to that of Cardinal Jean Lemoine who commented the Bull in a contrarr sense at the same period. See p. 150-153. 2/^,9.303-305.

4 *Ibid.,* p. 148-150. See above, 9. 636. —5 *Ibid.,* 9. 281-300.

Dante (1265-1321) revealed himself to be as great a theologian and mystic as poet in his *Divine Comedy* (13001318 circa) and it would be possible to treat this work here from that twofold viewpoint, but in the case of such a poem silence is better than praise and any summary could only lead to misapprehension. Let it be said however that the sureness of his Christian instinct as well as the clarity of his ideas and brilliance of expression transcends all the poetry that had until then been inspired by Christianity.

7 J. Rivière, *ibid.,* p. 239-340.

to see it dominate the whole world in the form of a monarchy that would ensure its political unity, just as the Church guarantees its religious unity. Though he exalts the empire, Dante freely recognises the religious superiority of the Church; though independent, the emperor remains subject to the latter even in his mission of government. Dante conceives the relations of Church and State as did John Quidort and the other theologians of the French school: "All were agreed on the religious conception of a State that was to be simultaneously independent of the pontifical power, yet subject to its lofty guidance." [1] Dante's imperialist leanings were harmful to the good repute of his book[2], just as the too evident nationalism of Quidort prejudiced his works. Since neither of these authors succeeded in setting out their teaching in a serene and objective manner, they failed to impose it. In reality it may be summed up as what is known as the theory of guiding power, or authority [3], a theory which is still disputed [4].

Dante's interpretation of imperialist tendencies at the beginning of the XIVth century was comparatively moderate. Far different was that of contemporary theologians who sought to withdraw the emperor from the influence of the Church, so that there should be

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 338.

[3] The *De monarchia,* which occasioned several refutations in the Middle Ages, was put on the *Index* in the XVIth cent., and was not taken off until Leo XIII. *Ibid.*, p. 339.

[3] A full *guiding power* is in question since it entails the right to inflict "remonstrances" or "sanctions". The defenders of this theory do not admit "all papal jurisdiction in temporal affairs in the true meaning of the term." J. Rivière, *op. cit.*, p. 306.

[4] According to Rivière the protagonists of the *(full) guiding authority* "surveyed the way in which modern theology has resolutely sought and perhaps found the theoretical formula of the relations that link together the two powers". *Ibid.*, p. 307; cf. p. 379-382. Journet writes on lhe contrary: "To our mind the system of the "guiding authority" is indubitably not in keeping with traditional doctrine, which has always believed in a true jurisdiction in temporal affairs, *ratione peccati,* nor with present-day theology which, in the steps of the masters of the XVIth and XVIIth centuries, affirms that the pope has the right to intervene authoritatively in temporal matters whenever this is demanded for the good of religion". *Op. cit.*, p. 669. This author therefore insists on a real *indirect authority* which implies a "veritable jurisdiction". This latter formula probably does not grant more real rights than the other (taken in its fullest sense) but it attaches them to a jurisdiction, and it is this that distinguishes it from the former opinion which makes no direct appeal to any jurisdiction. It nevertheless re-establishes it implicitly: for the right of "sanctions" it implies *(previous note)* can hardly be explained in the absence of some jurisdiction, which may of course, be of a very special kind.

no intermediary between him and God*. They thus paved the way for the legists, belated defenders of Caesaropapism and the theorists, who, under John XXII, rallied to Louis of Bavaria in his efforts to bridle the Church. The most famous of the latter was Marsilius of Padua[3]. In his chief work, the *Defensorpmcis* (1324)[4] he is revealed as a bold innovator, if not revolutionary, in ecclesiastical affairs. Yet he claimed to remain Catholic, loyal to the teaching of the Scriptures and tradition, which he understood as follows: in order to tend to his twofold end, temporal and spiritual, man disposes of a social organisation containing three great entities, the priesthood, the army and justice. These constitute the State, ruled by a head (elected) and a law (deriving from the people). The Church as a divine institution possesses jurisdiction over purely spiritual matters. All the faithful participate therein; the clergy have no right of property; the hierarchy is for the most part a human institution. All the spiritual and temporal rights of the papacy derive from the Donation of Constantine. The central government of the Church lies in the hands of the Council, of which the laity is a part as well as priests and bishops. Such are the main points ot this work, which has been rightly called an "infernal machine" placed at the service of imperialism[5]. Its audacity surpassed anything that had previously been evolved for the humbling of the papacy.

3. At the other extreme are found the defenders of the pontifical authority. They felt that they had vowed to maintain principles that were sacred; hence the boldness of their speculation, all the more vigorous in the measure they were attracted by the beauty of this spiritual ideal and impressed by the perils that threatened it from without. This extremely one-sided interest sometimes hindered them from seeing with equal clarity how far their principles extended in the direction of everyday reality. This state of mind is especially noticeable in Giles of Rome (Ægidius Romanus) of whom it has been written: "Not the least characteristic of his doctrinal tendency is that he seems untroubled by the humble contingencies of the human element when he is engaged in explaining the divine element in society. So much so, that his ideas, which are precise enough, and most certainly his explanation of them, remain incomplete... The author is one of those burning mystics who perceive things only in God and then go on to apply all the power of their minds to what they first

[2] SeeJ. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 308-317.
[3] Who were at the root of the struggle between the Church and the Empire.
[3] See above, p. 675.
[4] J. Rivière, *Did. théol.,* col. 155-195·
[5] For the condemnation by John XXII, *ibid.,* col. 165-172. Text of the propositions in Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion,* 495-500.

saw in the light of faith " x. Care should he taken, however, not to magnify this viewpoint, for it does not necessarily exclude aspects of the question which authors may have treated in other writings, as Giles did 1, or simply taken for granted, since they were under no compulsion to say everything that was to be said on the subject, in works that as a rule were not didactic.

It is evident that the medieval defenders of the pope tended to claim for him *strict rights in temporal government* in the name of the great religious principles. What constituted to their mind the exact nature of these rights is not so clear. Is the theory of *direct authority* or *power* to be ascribed to them, despite the above reservations3? Rivière has no hesitation in affirming that this represents the ideas of the majority of these theologians. He points out the " seeds " of this radical conception already existing in various earlier authors from the lime of Gregory VII4, and regards them as having come to fruition in the methodical explanation ot Giles of Rome and his disciple James of Viterbo5.

The publication6 of the treatise *De ecclesiastica potestate* showed that Giles of Rome, was not, as had long been thought7, an adversary but a keen defender of the rights of the papacy, not only in spiritual8 but also in temporal9 affairs. Against the legists, Giles, with admirable calm' and without polemical thrusts, establishes the dependence of temporal government with regard to the spiritual and in no way confuses them. He gives the right of possessing property to the Church and in some wise states that all property is dependent on her; he conceives the relations of the Church and Slate as those of the first Cause and the second cause : the pope is the general and chief steward of God, whose normal activity lies in the spiritual domain but exceptionally and with the fullest right10 1in the temporal. It has been rightly observed that throughout his work Giles speaks as a metaphysician rather than as a jurist or politician. No less does he write as a mystic, deriving all the privileges of the pope from his relations to God and Christ, Whose vicar he is This teaching has caused the Archbishop of Bourges to be

1 J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 226-227.

2 The *De regimine principum,* Aristotelian in tone, shows that Giles was aware of the political and social order and was a capable observer. *Ibid.,* p. 225.

3 It is impossible to give a rigorous juridical meaning to formulas that were inspired by predominantly mystical aspirations. —4 J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 11 60.

5 *lbid.,* \>. 191-251. —6 By Ch. Jourdain, 1858.

7 It was probably on account of his family name, Colonna, that he was thought to l>e sympathetic to the adversary of Boniface VIII, and he passed as the author of the *Quasi10 in utramque partem* mentioned above, p. 67 S.

9 In his prologue he attributes the supreme doctrinal authority, even infallibility, to the Sovereign Pontiff.

De polestate ipsius super temporalia qua dicenda sunt compellimur diffusili: enarrare.

temporal things belong to the Church *per se sed non primo* ; on the contrary they immediately concern the State. J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 217-219.

11 *Dei 7. icarius carissimus* (in, 9); *Christi vicarius generalis* (in, io).

regarded as the first great proponent of the *direct power* of the popes in temporal matters [*].

James of Viterbo, (d. 1307) a disciple of Giles of Rome became Archbishop of Benevento and then of Naples (about 1302-1303)[1][2]. His book *De regimine christiano* [3], dealing with the same question as that of Giles, has been termed " the oldest treatise on the Church ". Like his master, James "avoids controversy and keeps to the serene heights of doctrine"; he writes as a philosopher and theologian rather than as a canonist [4]. He teaches the same doctrine as Giles, but with greater moderation : " He makes a clearer distinction of the two planes, the natural and the supernatural; in the latter he discusses the spiritual powers of the papacy, compares them with its temporal power and connects both with the authority of Christs. With James of Viterbo, the somewhat forthright thesis of Giles takes on the appearance of a classical teaching and later history witnesses that for a long period it was to be generally accepted as such "[6].* We should remark however that the last editor of the work finds himself unable to admit so strict an interpretation [7].

A colleague of the two Augustinian Archbishops, who entered the Order before them, Augustinus Triumphus, also placed his talents and learning at the service of the same cause. He is remembered especially on account of the audacity of his argumentation. Several of his opuscula written about 1308 already reveal his absolutist leanings, despite their practical rather than doctrinal nature[8]. The same leaching is still more emphatically stated in the form of theses in the 112 questions of his *Summa depotestate ecclesiastica* (1320). These were possibly written at the instance of John XXII and were in any case meant to offset his adversaries' teaching. Unfortunately, Augustinus exceeded all bounds and attributed unlimited authority to the pope : " Even the Sovereign Pontiff himself knows not how far his supreme authority extends" (q. I, a. 1).

1 "Theocracy" as it is freely called in certain circles.

[8] See above, p. 639 and 673.

3 H. X. ARQUILLIÈRE, *Le plus ancien traité de l'Eglise. Jacques de Viterbe. De regimine christiano* (1301-1302). Study of the sources, critical ed., Paris, 1926. See also J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 145-148, 228-251 (analysis).

4 J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 229.

5 The pope is the heir of Christ in his twofold priestly and royal function. *De reg christ.,* 11, 9. — 6 J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 251.

" " We cannot consider fames of Viterbo as a pure theocrat, as we have pointed out in our edition of the *De regimine christiano,* which appeared at the same time as M. Riviere's book ". X. Arquillière, in *Rev. Apol.,* Dec. 19-8, p. 7[illegible]7-758.

s Defence of Boniface VIII; *De duplici potestate; De potestate collegii mortuo ¡afa; Defacto Templariorum.* Cf. J. Rivière, *op. at.,* p. 35°*357> 375-376.

The Augustinians were not alone in entering the "theological lists" where the defenders and opponents of the papacy came to grips, particularly from the time of Boniface VIII.

Henry of Cremona (d. 1312) a Roman canonist, in the year 1301, before his elevation to the See of Reggio, wrote an opusculum *De potentia papa* in which he castigates the "perfidious Ghibellines" and others who deny to the pope "jurisdictionem in temporalibus per totum mundum" [*].

The French cardinal Jean Lemoine in 1303 made a gloss on the bull *Unam sanctam,* in favour of full pontifical authority[1].

The Dominican, Plòlemy of Lucca, put forward a similar teaching in that part of the *De regimine principimi* which he wrote[3] and especially in a *Determinatio compendiosa* which appears to have been composed by him [4].

The Spanish Franciscan Alvarius Pelagius[5] (d. 1352) grand penitentiary at Avignon under John XXII, who made him a bishop in Achaia and then at Silves in Portugal, from whence he was driven out, also took an active part in the controversy by means of various writings. The best known is the treatise *De planctu ecclesia·* (about 1330). In this work the author outspokenly deplores the wretched state of the Church, the clergy and the laity, and can perceive but one cure : the extension of the rights and privileges of the Holy See. He bases his thesis on his forerunners and does not hesitate to reproduce word for word the *De regimine christiano* of James of Viterbo.

The real worth of these authors lies in the fact that they defended the cause of the papacy, unaffected by motives of national interest which tainted in a great measure the speculation of the imperial theologians and others. Yet though the cause they served was spiritual enough from this viewpoint they often failed to isolate it sufficiently from the social conditions of the period. Great confusion prevails in their works "on account of the elements of feudal law and the public law of Christendom which are constantly and necessarily involved in their theological considerations"[6].* The exaggerations of those who claimed for the Church *direct* power in temporal matters are evident[7] : nothing of the kind was ever demanded either by the Council of Trent or Leo XIII when they clarified the Catholic idea of the pre-eminence of the Church[8]. Seen in this light, these

1 J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 138-141, 165-170, 180-181. —2 *Ibid.,* p. 151-155.
3 See above, p. 637. —4 See J. Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 322-327.
5 Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 11, p. 626-627.
6 Y. de la Brière, *Pouvoir pontifical,* in *Diet. Apol.,* col. 106.
7 Their error was also fraught with danger, on account of the inevitable abuses that resulted on the part of the enemies of the Church.
8 RENT·» Sess. XXV, De reform., cxx. Leo XIII, Enc. *Immortale Det* (1885), Denzinger, *Each. Sym.,* n. 1866.

authors interpreted tradition no better than their adversaries. Saint Augustine, whom they were so fond of invoking would certainly not have approved all the applications they made of his principles [1]. These bold apologists of the spiritual authority, however, were possibly not so numerous as may at first appear when we recall that much of their teaching was due to their mystical aspirations[2]; the latter often militate against the expression of their speculative theories in the form of juridical formulas, involving a deliberate confusion of the spiritual and temporal orders [3].

B). The central government of the Church.

I. The question of the central government of the Church was occasionally raised in the course of the foregoing controversies. At the time of the Great Schism, towards the end of the XIVth century (1378-1417) it stood in the forefront of mens' minds [4]. For may centuries the true doctrine had been known; not only was it set forth clearly in the Gospels, but tradition also shewed it as neither a democracy nor an aristocracy but as an absolute monarch)'; the pope, the successor of Peter is the one and supreme head and teacher of the Church. This had been the unanimous teaching of the Middle Ages and the tendency was to widen rather than narrow the pope's authority. But with the coining of the Great Schism of the West the pope's spiritual as well as his temporal power was placed in doubt. The Council of Constance (1414-1418), called together for the purpose of restoring unity and which finally succeeded [5]

1 *De Civ. Dei,* v, 24 (*P. L.,* 41, 170-171); *Conira Ctesconium,* ill, 50 (Λ Z., 43, 527); *Ej>.* 155 (to Macedonius, io), 1S5 (to Boniface, 19) (*P. L.,* 33, 670-671 and 801). See G. Combés, *Doctrine politique de S. Augustin,* Paris, 1927› P· 322'324· For the medieval interpretation, see *ibid.,* p. 432-443 (very like that of J. Rivière).

2 They were animated by no spirit of worldly' conquest, but by' an excessive or ill-instructed zeal to foster a purely spiritual outlook in the world. Rivière brings this out very well with regard to Giles of Rome (p. 224-227).

3 A case very similar to that of the *relations betweenfaith and reason:* the two orders were sometimes confused in the Middle Ages; y'et often enough, also, there was a simple union of the two truths, inspired by a very lively faith, desirous of seeing all things in the light of God. See above, p, 506 sq.

4 See especially L. SALEMBIER, *Le Grand Schisme d'Occident,* Paris, 1921 (5th cd.).

5 The exceptional measures adopted by the Council which were justified by the circumstances, were not made to be used as a foundation for a general teaching on the government of the Church. This was not realised by contemporary theologians. Cf. L. Salembier, *op. cit.,* p. 310 sq.

had its share of unfortunate sessions [1] whose acts were never approved : such were the decrees proclaiming the council to be greater than the pope[2], which were destined to be used over a long period by the doctrinaires of Gallicanism [3].

The origins of the conciliary theories[4] must nevertheless be sought at an earlier date. They were maintained at the very outset of the Schism in various circles. " They were introduced into the Church by a certain group of theologians avid for novelty : they were defended and propagated from the end of the xivth century, even within the University itself. Paris led to Constance, or at least made it possible"[5]. Salembier considers *Ockham* to have been the villain of the piece[6] for it was he who chiefly fostered the growth of these doctrines, though he may not have been responsible for their inception[7] or their final expression. They were, of course, presented in various garbs. At the decline of the xivth century they found famous defenders in Pierre d'Ailly and Jean Gerson.

Pierre d'Ailly[8] (1350-1420), a brilliant doctor at the Sorbonne (1381, Chancellor of the University (1389) favoured Ockham's teaching in many questions. In 1380 he gave voice to the doubts that were then troubling the best minds of the time. He conceived the Church, not as a monarchy but as an *aristocracy*[9]: the council is greater than the pope, whom it may judge and depose if he is refractory. The sovereign pontiff is not necessarily the bishop of Rome. The pope is not infallible; this is the privilege of the Universal Church ; and since it is conceivable that all the clergy may fall away, the deposit of revelation could be preserved merely by a few holy souls, pious layfolk. Such were the ideas[10] of the future Archbishop of Cambrai (1397) one of the most influential figures of his time. In practice an adherent of the Avignon pope, he skilfully and untiringly endeavoured to restore unity, first by negotiation, and later at Pisa 1409 (John xxm made him cardinal in 1411), and lastly at Constance where he presided at some sessions. His treatise *Super reformatione Ecclesia?,* greatly to the taste of xvith century Protestants, was written on the eve of the council and contains excellent plans for reformation; but it also reveals that d'Ailly never relinquished his earlier ideas.

1 Particularly sessions tv and v, held on March 3rd and April 6th 1415.

3 The substance of the 5 articles of the 5th session.

3 The declaration of 16S2 is but a later version.

4 The general theory of the superiority of the council should not be separated from other ideas from which it derives or which constitute its application.

5 L. Salembier, *op. cit.,* p. 119.

6 L. Salembier, *Diet, th.,* col. 646.

7 The pope's adversaries, previous to Ockham, helped to sow the seed of discord.

8 L. Salembier, *Petrus de Iliaco,* Lille, 1SS6; *Ailly (Pierre d'),* *Did. th.,* col. 642-654.

9 */bid.,* col. 647.

10 These were often no more than simple hypotheses, yet significant enough when compared with other contemporary doctrines. *' Le Grand Schisine.* p. 112-130.

Gerson r, Jean le Charlier de Gerson (1363-1429), Pierre d'Ailly's pupil in Paris and his successor as chancellor in 1395 (when d'Ailly was made Bishop of Puy) also played a great rôle in the religious troubles at the outset of the XVth century[1][2]. His doctrinal outlook was much the same as that of Pierre d'Ailly, though it had a more marked democratic tendency. He had fallen under the spell of "William Ockham, the evil genius of the XIVth century. His practice was generally more moderate and more sound than his *theory* "[3]. Gerson admits "a monarchical primacy supernaturally and directly founded by Christ"; it pertains to the Roman Church but not to the Bishop of Rome who possesses no direct authority over all the faithful[4] and is in no way infallible[5]. The pope is subject to the council which has power to judge, condemn and even depose him. Not only bishops but also priests have a vote in the council, and no layman may be excluded from this great gathering. And at Constance he did *in fact* " demand, as a convinced believer in the superiority of doctors over bishops, that Doctors of " theology and of Canon and Civil Law should be given a deliberative and deciding vote *in rebus fidei* discussed in the council. Such was the outcome of his democratic leanings "[6][7]. He was one of the chief authors of the " Decrees of Constance"; his undoubted zeal for the unity of the Church was nourished to excess on the exceptional circumstances of his time[7].

Gerson's writings are considerable[8]. As a general rule he devoted himself to practical, moral and spiritual matters. His treatises on the *reform* of government of the Church bear witness to the turn of his mind. He wrote no complete *moral summa,* but as circumstances dictated he composed a great number of *opuscula* on the most varied subjects, both theoretical and practical. He took a keen interest in young people — the students at the University,—guiding their reading and conduct (condemning the *Roman ile la Rose,* etc.),—and little

1 L. Salembier, *Gerson,* in *Did. th.,* col. 1313-1330. A. Baudrii.lart, *Constance (cone, de),* in *Did. th.,* col. 1200-1224.

9 At a later date he became parish priest of Saint Jean-en-Greve, though still remaining in the University.

3 L. Salembier, *ibid.,* col. 1318.

4 In him authority is subjective or executive.

5 He supposes the case of an heretical pope, and affirms the obligation of incarcerating such a one, judging him, and even casting him into the sea.

6 L. Salembier, *Gerson,* in *Did. th.,* col. 1319.

7 Gerson's great treatises on these questions are the *De aitferibililate papié ab Ecclesia; De potestate ecclesiastica.*

8 Richer's editions (Paris, 1606, 4 vols), Ellies-Dupin, Antwerp, 1706, 5 vols.

children *(De parvulis ad Christum trahendis...)*[1]. His somewhat erudite *oratorical work,* is a contrast to the exceedingly familiar preaching of the time. It comprises sermons in the vernacular as well as Latin discourses for great occasions. Passing over his biblical commentaries and his verse, we should at least mention his *works on spirituality,* perhaps the best part of his literary bequest[2].

During the sorrows that marked the last years of his life Gerson turned more and more to God. His *De consolatione theologice,* modelled on Boethius' work but nobler in its objects, shows that true joy is to be found in hope, the Scriptures, patience and pious study. Gerson composed this dialogue after the council, during the year (1418-1419) which he was forced to spend in Germany in a Benedictine abbey, in hiding from the ire of John the Fearless: he had incurred the terrible duke's hatred by his condemnation of tyrannicide[4]. On the death of the Duke of Burgundy, he was able to return to France but not to Paris which was still in the hands of the Burgundians. He went instead to Lyons, where he died in 1429, regretted by all honest folk and particularly by the children to whom he had preached the words of God. Shortly before he died he wrote two books in defence of the divine mission of Joan of Arc. He had had time to reflect how chimerical were his plans for governing the Church by means of regular councils.

2. The great Schism of the West was not essentially a revolt against the papacy and it was only incidentally that the papal authority was placed in question. From this point of view the Eastern Schism was much more serious for it was a rebellion against the head of the Church. Yet those responsible for the split were clever enough to draw men's minds to other aspects: ritualistic differences and supposed doctrinal innovations concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost[5]. Such subjects constituted the theme of the interminable complaints of the Byzantine controversialists from the time of Caerularius until 1453[6].

* Fr. trad., Saubin, Paris, 1909. —2 See the following chapter, p. 709.

3 The work contains 5 books, like the original, but the author's thought moves in a supernatural plane.

4 Denzinger-B., *Enchirid.,* n. 690. John the Fearless murdered the Duke of Orleans in 1407. The Franciscan jean Petit declared tyrannicide to be lawful, but Gerson denounced it and procured its condemnation.

5 See above, 377-3S0.

6 It is well known how artificial and vain were such controversies and how often they did no more than beat the air. They contributed nothing to theological learning. We shall say nothing of them here.

"During all this period the primacy of the Roman Pontiff was rarely combated, at least *ex professo;* indeed, it was clearly taught by some, who nevertheless denied his infallibility " L From the Xllth century, however, although the procession of the Holy Ghost remained the mainstay of the controversies, " it should not be overlooked that attacks on the primacy of the Roman See become more frequent and more violent; and some polemists went as far as to see the chief cause of the Schism in the pride of the roman pontiffs " 2.

Attempts at reconciliation were made again and again. At least twenty have been described 3. Of these, two alone led to a certain measure of short-lived unity. Their chief merit lies in their reiterated assertion of the traditional doctrine. The profession of faith signed at Lyons (1274) ends with an explicit recognition of the Roman Primacy4. Michael VIII Paleologus, in spite of the opposition with which he met both in the East and the West, loyally supported the act of union until his death, when it became a dead letter. During the Xivth century every threat to Constantinople by the Turks led to are-opening of negotiations. Even the Council of Constance provided an opportunity. Finally at *Florence* (1439) they met with success5. The Dominican, John of Ragusa, provincial of Lombardy, explained the doctrine of the primacy of the pope, whose jurisdiction, though effective as well as spiritual, in no way diminishes that of the bishops, patriarchs and the emperor6. The Decree of Union ended with a fresh and explicit affirmation of this universal primacy of the Bishop of Rome7. Yet this agreement proved to be as brittle as all those that had gone before.

In every century eminent defenders of the unity of the Church were found even in the bosom of the Byzantine Church. Among these the following were particularly outstanding.

John Veccos (d. 1296)8* Patriarch from 1275 t0 I2^2 resolutely opposed the union at the outset, but when he realised how baseless

' M. Jugie, *Theologia dogm. christ. orientalium,* Paris, vol. I, 1926, p. 339.

3 *Ibid.,* p. 416.

3 See S. Vaiihé, *Constantinople (Eglise de)* in *Diet, th.,* col. 1375-1402. M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 402-404, 416. —4 DeNZINGER-B., *Enchiridion,* n. 466.

5 A. VOGT, *Flotenee (concile de)* in *Diet, th.,* col. 24-50. See also the introductions to the texts edited by Mgr L. Petit, in *P. O.,* vol. 15, 17·

6 " *Hoc non ptcejudicat potestati imperatoris, quia illa ut m civilibus et ttmporalïbus, hac est ecclesiastica et spiritualis.* As there are two great luminaries, the sun and the moon, so are there two powers which must combine for the wellbeing of all. This has always been the great Roman teaching ". Vogt, *ibid.,* col. 43. —7 Denzinger-B., *Etichi) ia.,* n. 694.

8 Mgr L. Petit, *Jean Beccos* or */can XI,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 656-660. M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 418-421.

were the complaints against Rome that made the rounds in the East he became an ardent apostle of unity, both during his patriarchate and also after his deposition, despite the persecution to which he was subjected. He was truly a confessor of the faith and by means of his works, especially his theological writings, he endeavoured to dispel the prejudices of his countrymen. He wielded a very real doctrinal authority. We can only regret that he met with so much opposition.

Demetrius Cydones[1] (1320-1400) secretary to John Cantacuzene at Constantinople, was an assiduous reader of St. Thomas' *Siitfima theologica.* It was thus he learned Latin, with the help of a Dominican. He also dipped into the Latin Fathers. He was not long in realising the idiocy of the charges brought against the Catholics by the Byzantines; whereupon he was converted, and devoted all his literary talent to the propagation of the Catholic faith. Having been attacked, he explained his motives in several apologetical works. His *controversial* writings are fairly numerous, but are outnumbered by his Greek translations of Latin works, among which that of the *Summa contra Genies* and the *Summa theologica* (the Ia, the majority of the Ia-IIæ and all the IIa-IIæ) take first place.

Bessarion[2][3] (1395?-1472) a native of Trebizond, an ordained monk and celebrated theologian and orator, lived in Morea and then at Constantinople where he was in favour with John VII Paleologus from whom he received the metropolitan see of Nicea (1437). His eyes were opened by the negotiations at Florence and he was sincerely converted to Catholicism. He got a cold welcome when he returned to Constantinople. Taking refuge in Rome (1439) he was soon made a cardinal and spent his remaining years working for unity. Both his personality and his learning earned him great authority and he was nearly elected pope in 1455. He left philosophical, theological and ascetic works. But his chief interest lay in the unity of the Church and he paved the way effectively to an agreement.

The activity of these men was offset by that of the more numerous anti-Latin polemists, whose violence reached its peak in the xivth century. The Greek Church, of course, harboured clearer minds who adopted a more pacific position; they were considered as *latinizers (latinophrones)'t* lout their influence was not vigorous enough to restrain the hotheads and prevent prejudice from obscuring truth in the country as a wholes.

1 M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 476-480. E. Bouvv, *Les traducteurs byzantins de* 5. T'A., in *Revue Aug.* 1910 (vol. XXl), p. 401-408.

- *Ibid.,* p. 483-486. A. Palmieri, *Bessarion,* in *Diet, th.,* col. 801-807.

3 For all these authors, see M. Jugie, *op. cit.,* p. 404-490.

CHAPTER XIV.

Schools of Spirituality in the Middle Ages.

Special Bibliography for the whole of the chapter.—P. POURRAT, *La spiritualité chrétienne,* li, Paris, 1921 (Middle Ages). A. SAUDREAU, *La vie d'union à Dieu d'après les grands Maîtres de la spiritualité,* Angers, 1921. F. VERNET, *La spiritualité médiévale,* Paris, 1929.

SCHOOLS OF SPIRITUALITY IN GENERAL.

The explanation of the intense doctrinal movement that characterised the Middle Ages is to be found not only in the theological schools which shaped speculation, but also in the schools of spirituality[1] which moulded the growth of the interior life. Spirituality has always played a large part in the history of doctrine but never more than in the Middle Ages. At this period it was often caught up with speculation and when theological method became wholly speculative as in the works of St. Thomas it retained its place and became an important and significant subject in the doctrinal synthesis. Thus far we have passed in review the greatest spiritual masters of the period, insisting especially on doctors who—with the exception of St. Bernard—were primarily theologians. It remains to bring together in a synthetic form all that has been touched upon in previous chapters, and this general outline, completed by a number of fresh considerations, should indicate the various tendencies of Christian spirituality, tendencies that may be said to constitute schools of thought.

These divergences however should on no account be magnified, and points that are common to all Catholic schools should be carefully noted. And first comes *submission to the authority of the Church,* which rules out all the false spirituals who were legion in the Middle Ages[2]: the

[1] See the *Introduction* to Book iv, p. 363 sq.
[2] See the General Histories of the Church.

Waldensians [1], Amalricians [2], Joachimites, or Apocalyptics [3], Apostolic Brethren [4], spirituals [5], Fraticelli [6,7] or Béguins [7], and lastly Beghards [8,9]. Quite different were the "Friends of God" [9]. A general characteristic of medieval Catholic spirituality was its leaning to *mysticism;* the errors of the false spirituals should not be allowed to obscure this trait, for its omission is bound to result in the disfigurement of medieval spirituality and a misunderstanding of many of the forms in which it was manifested [10]. The *ascesis* was also one of its outstanding features: it is obvious that in every school, the Christian moral and theological virtues were held in great respect, since they constitute the basis of all true

1 Disciples of Peter of Vaux or Peter Valdo, a merchant of Lyons who gave away his possessions and preached poverty' about 1173, the heretical and rebellious Waldensians were excommunicated in 1184. They were also called the *Poor Men of Lyons,* the *Poor Men of Lombardy,* the *Humiliated, Leonists* (from Lyons) and *Insabatati* (wearers of sandals).

2 Amalricians, disciples of *Amairie of Benes* (see p. 479) were pantheists and taught a true divinisation of man by lhe Holy Ghost. There are associated with the *Brethren of the Free Spirit.*

3 The Joachimites were disciples of Joachim of Flora (d. 1202) Cistercian abbot of Flora (Calabria) author of a *Concordia utriusque Testamenti* and an *Apocalypsis nova* (commentary) in which it is declared that after the early period of the Father (Old Testament) and the middle or semi-spiritual period of the Son, lhe third and purely spiritual period of the Holy Ghost is imminent. E. Jordan, *Joachim de Flore (le bienheureux)* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 1425-1458. Joachimism was the source of most of the pseudo-mysticism of the XIIIlh and XIVth centuries. One of Joachim's Trinitarian errors was condemned in 1215: he claimed that the unity of essence in God is not *vera* and *propria.*

4 The Apostolic Brethren, disciples of an ex-Franciscan, Gerard Segarelli, preached poverty and went to the extent of condemning the Church. They fell into Pantheist mysticism. Cf. F. Vernet, *Apostoliques (heretics)* in *Did. th.,* col. 1632-1634.

5 The Spirituals were followers of the strict Franciscan observance and adepts of the Joachimite mysticism. Their various theories were set out by Gerard of Borgo author of a *Liber mtroditelorius in Evangelium aternum* (about 1254), John Olivi (see above, p. 495) Ubertino of Casale (in *Arbor vita Crucifixa feste,* about 1305). See E. Jordan, *Joachim de Flore,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 1443-1455.

6 The Fraticelli were extremists among the spirituals at the beginning of the XIVth century who revolted against John XXII (at the same lime as many Conventuals, among whom was the deposed superior Michael of Cesena). F. Vernet, *Fralicelles,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 770-784.

7 The Béguins were Franciscan terliaries who were drawn into the revolt of the Fraticelli. *Lbid., 771.*

8 The Beghards, often confused with the Béguins, should rather be classed with the sects of the *free spirit,* like the heterodox Beguines. See above, n. 2.

9 The Friends of God were Rhenish Jayfolk and clergy', who, in the xivth century, helped to spread a mystical teaching; though some of them fell into illuminism, as a whole they wielded a healthy and fruitful influence. See above, p. 363.

spirituality. They may be practised, of course in different ways, and it was this that distinguished the schools, but their necessity and the sincere desire of acquiring them remained a fundamental law forali. It may be added that medieval spirituality evinced a particular propensity for *apostolic labours,* a consequence of the interior life. The *opus Dei,* the liturgical office in choir, still remained, of course, one of the great obligations of the religious ;* but the new Orders, especially the Dominicans and Franciscans, fostered a true spiritual revival throughout Christendom by means of their preaching and Third Orders. Even the contemplatives, such as the Cistercians, found a place for apostolic action in their retiring lives, even could they not, like St. Bernard, preach the Gospel to the masses. Such action of course, may take many different forms, of which theology itself is one, provided "it derives from the fulness of contemplation" as St. Thomas puts it.

This fundamental agreement which underlies every form of Catholic spirituality does not however exclude a number of special characteristics of secondary but far from negligible importance which may be used in order to classify the schools. The initiative of a few men filled with the Spirit of God, an initiative that was carried on by their disciples, brought the schools into being2; but the characteristics of the latter depend on the very nature of their spirituality. Though the ascetic striving of every school tended towards the contemplative life, they do not all ascribe equal importance to this *mystical element.* On this point the masters of the Xivth century Dionysian school surpassed all others and particularly deserve the title of mystics. The ascetic practices themselves are rich in *means oj holiness;* several of them are accessory, at least in certain fixed forms, and since it is not possible to employ them all, it is right and prudent to make a choice dictated by one's particular purpose or character; this is the explanation of the above mentioned divergences. These, furthermore, are differentiated by the *ejects that are produced* and which, differing one from another,

* The suppression of the choir office was one of St. Ignatius' innovations. See p. 800.

' Some authors explain the rise of these schools by means of national temperament and character. We prefer to underline the personal doctrinal or practical influence of those who inspired these different movements, and who were true *spiritual masters.*

often imply some particularity in the depths of the interior life from which they spring.

It would appear impossible to classify the schools according to the speculative or practical nature of their doctrine. The object of all true spirituality, the Christian and perfect life, perforce rendersit practical; yet this does not rule out the explanation of its necessary speculative *theory,* or its study in view of its directly practical application. In one and the same school may be found works of both kinds: St. Thomas makes a theoretical study of spirituality in the of the *Summa;* St. Vincent Ferrier considers it from a wholly practical viewpoint in his *De vita spirituali.* Even one and the same author sometimes composed extremely speculative works side by side with eminently practical writings, St. Bonaventure, for instance[1]. Moreover, it is possible for some association, guided by the special end at which it aims, to produce mainly speculative theological works; an instance of this is the Dominican Order. Others engaged for the most part in a practical apostleship, as did the Carthusians and the Congregation of Windesheim. It is needless to say that both these forms of spirituality can be termed practical inasmuch as they both represent a truly Christian and Catholic manifestation of charity.

II. REVIVAL OF THE EARLY SCHOOLS IN THE XIIth CENTURY.

A). Benedictine School. Cluny.

At the beginning of the Middle Ages Cluny[2] was a living example of all that is best in the Benedictine ideal, whereby the monk is gently encouraged in the practice of contemplation and tends towards the highest form of union with God. The means at his disposal are found in the *Rule oí* St. Benedict which, moreover is not interpreted literally as regards many of its prescriptions, but rather in keeping with its *spirit.* Of these means, those that are more characteristic of the Benedictine contemplative life are : I. the liturgy and especially the singing of the divine praise in choir, for this is the peculiar obligation of the monk; 2. a life of retreat in community, in monasteries, which though often of enormous extent are filled with tranquillity; 3. a moderate degree of active life, calm and regulated in its exercise which excludes all absorbing exterior occupations; 4. work of

[1] See above, p. 501 sq.

[2] This monastery, founded in 910, had for its first abbot, St. Berno (d. 927'. Tiie more famous of his successors were SS. Odo (d. 942), Mayeul (d. 994) and Odilo (d. 1048) and Hugh (d. 1109) whose works may be found in *P. L,* *33» χ37» Σ42» an‹i 159· Cf. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* vol. 1.

a studious and pious nature for those who are able, in preference to manual work; 5. a real though tempered austerity, in keeping with the demands of health or climate; 6. lastly, a love of the decorative arts used in divine worship and considered as a means for raising the soul to God.

Peter the Venerable (d. 1156) the most famous of all the abbots of Cluny was led to defend this Benedictine ideal in the face of the criticisms of the Cistercians[1]* who were supported by St. Bernard himself.

St. Anselm (d. 1109) the great Benedictine doctor of the Middle Ages was Abbot of Bee before he became Archbishop. He also represents the Benedictine school of spirituality, but with him the latter is tinged with Augustinism which makes it more akin to the teaching of Saint-Victor than to that of Cluny [2].

Rupert of Deutz (d. 1135) a native of Liège, Abbot of the monastery of Deutz near Cologne, author of many commentaries on the books of the Old and the New Testament, had a deep devotion for the Blessed Trinity. This devotion inspired him to write several treatises and especially a great work in 42 books *(De Trinitate et operibus ejus)*[3].

Saint Hildegarde[4] (d. 1179) Abbess of Rupertsberg near *Bingen* (not far from Mainz) was a renowned clairvoyant, consulted by princes and prelates. Though quite unlettered[5] she composed great works[6],* notably a general explanation of dogma *(Seivias)*, a treatise of moral theology *(Liber vitee meritorum)* and a work of a scientific nature which, though not consistently good, is very much in advance of its time *(Liber divinorum operum).* These revelations, however, were never specially approved by the Church. With the exception of a number of strange opinions, her doctrine as a whole " follows the great current of Catholic Tradition

John of Castel, Benedictine monk of the Abbey of Castel, in the Xivth century, appears to be the author of the famous treatise *De adhœrendo Deo,* which was long ascribed to St. Albert the Great. This restitution is based on early manuscripts[8].

[1] *Epist.,* I, 28, *P. L.,* 189, 112-159. In addition to his letters Peter the V. wrote several valuable apologetical works. *P. L.,* 189.

[2] See above, p. 411.

[3] Works in *P. L.,* t. 167-170.

[4] F. Vernet, *Hildegarde (sainte)* in *Diet, th.,* col. 246S-24S0.

[5] She used to dictate to nuns who worked as her secretaries, but the work was then revised by a monk.

[6] In *P. L.,* 197 (defective edit.). Other partial editions.

[7] F. Vernet, *op. cit.,* col. 2477. Modern critics have made a more severe study of her works and claim to find Pantheist leanings. Cf. M. DE WULF, *Hist, phil. mid.,* 11, p. 203.

[8] See Grabmann. Studies in *Bened. Monatschrift,* 1920, p. 96-202; *Theol. quarlalschnft,* 1920, p. 186-235. The attribution has been adopted and confirmed by Dom J. Huyben, *Pie spirit.,* 19-22 (vol. vu), p. (22-37), (So-ioi). Fr. Théry however hesitates to accept it as final; *ibid.*

B). Cistercian School.

The literal interpretation of the Rule of St. Benedict has given to the Cistercian Order its own peculiar character, a character that is nowhere more evident than in its spirituality, for it is this that more particularly reflects the influence of St. Bernard. A tendency to *contemplation,* to the mystical union with God is strongly marked[1]; in consequence, the means adopted for its attainment were more rigorous than at Cluny. The *liturgy* was still the great business of the monk by which not only did he glorify God with his lips, but also raised his heart to Him. The better to foster this spiritual raising of the heart and mind, the greatest *austerity* was practised both in psalmody and in the furnishing of the Church, lest sensible delights should hinder the interior aspirations of the soul. On the other hand, the *human nature of Christ* was considered to be the swiftest and surest way of leading the soul to God. This teaching has always been found throughout the Church, but St. Bernard explained it to his Cistercians with such an infectious enthusiasm that it led on every side to a rekindling of devotion to the Childhood and Passion of Our Lord as well as a greater love for Our Lady. The meditation of Our Saviour's Passion nourished the ardour of the monk as he lived austerely in his poor monastery, *working* for the most part with his hands and eating very ordinary and unappetising food. Only a spirituality as strong as it was sweet, enabled the Cistercians to support such an existence.

St. Bernard was the chief author of this spirituality in which lies the secret of his influence down the centuries[2].

William of Saint-Thierry[3] (d. 1147 or 1148) born at Liège, was first Benedictine Abbot of Saint-Thierry (1120-1135) and then a Cistercian at Signy and a firm friend of St. Bernard, to whom he denounced Abelard's errors. He was the author of a little spiritual *opusculum* attributed to St. Bernard and which enjoyed great popularity: *Treatise on the Solitary Life* (or Letters to the brethren of Mont-Dieu).

Blessed Joachim of Flora[4] (d. 1201 or 1202) also a Cistercian "appears to have been a true contemplative, withdiawn from the world and indifferent to the things of earth he died in odour

1 During a period of nearly 20 years St. Bernard commented the Canticle of Canticles to all bis choir monks. —2 See above, p. 430-441.

3 A* Adam, *Guillaume de S.-Thierry, sa vie, ses œuvres,* Bourg, 1903.

4 E. JORDAN, *Joachim de ft.,* in *Diet, th.,* col. 1425-1458.

of sanctity. Like St. Bernard lie wielded a great deal of influence, especially after his death, but this proved somewhat dangerous on account of his doubtful apocalyptic speculations of which the Middle ages were so avid.

Saint Gertrude the Great* (1256-1301) a Cistercian nun of Helfta near Eisleben (Saxony) was profoundly influenced by St. Bernard', especially from the moment, when, having beheld a vision of Christ, she determined to live a perfect life[3]. Strengthened by great graces of prayer, she successfully encouraged her sisters in the same way of life. Two widely read works testify to her zeal: the *Exercises* (seven in number) and the *Revelations* (in 5 books)[4] of which the real title is *Legatus* (Messenger) *divina pietatis* [5]. This last work, which is partly descriptive is filled with meditations: the saint loved to rise to God by means of the liturgy or by contemplating nature. She had a tender devotion for the human nature of Christ and already in the XIIth century began to spread the devotion to the Sacred Heart[6]. Her spirituality was affective and practical.

Saint Bridget of Sweden[7] (1302-1373) was of royal blood. After the death of her husband she founded (1363) a monastery of nuns at Alvastra according to the Cistercian rule and that of St. Augustine; she pressed the popes to reform the Curia and return to Rome. She is better known however for her *Revelations*[8], which contain extremely animated descriptions of the Passion of Christ and sing the glories of Mary. They were given special ecclesiastical approval. The piety of St. Bridget is akin to that of St. Gertrude.

C) Augustinian School of Saint-Victor.

The School of Saint-Victor revived Augustinism in the XIIth century more wholeheartedly than the other schools:

[1] Called thus to distinguish her from St. Gertrude of Nivelles (Belgium) (d. 659) the daughter of Pepin of Landen. She has also been wrongly confused with Gertrude of Hackeborn (1232-1291) Abbess of the monastery of Helfta from 1251, and thus the saint's superior.

[2] She also quotes St. Augustine, St. Greg, the Great and Hugh of St. Victor.

[3] This "conversion" may be likened to that of St. Teresa. Cf. p. 802.

[4] The second alone was written by Gertrude: books 3, 4 and 5 were notes taken at her dictation. The first was composed after her death and forms an introduction to the collection.

[5] It is possible that she, together with another sister, also drafted the *Book of Special Grace* by Saint Mechtilde OE Hackeborn. The latter was chorister in the monastery and Gertrude was her assistant: that was her only office.

St. Mechtilde of Hackeborn (d. 129S), her mistress, shared the same devotion and propagated it in her writings. The Revelations of the two Saints have sometimes been edited together. At the same period there also came to Udita a beguine, St. Mechtilde of Magdeburg (d. 1280) who likewise honoured the Sacred Heart, and wrote a spiritual work *(The light of the divinity).* See Mme Ancelet-Hustache, *Mecht. de* Study of religious psychology, Paris, 1926.

[7] P. Pourrat, *Im spirit. chrit.,* it, p. 136-146.

[8] Comprising 8 books and a supplement (written by the Cistercian prior of Alvastra).

St. Bernard was above all an ascetic and a mystic; the Victorines were also philosophers and theologians, putting all their learning at the service of their mysticism. They found their inspiration in the works of St. Augustine, blit they added fresh elements deriving from Dionysius the Areopagite which emphasised the Platonism of their master. St. Anselm was their immediate forerunner. The foremost representatives of this school were Hugh and Richard whom we have already studied r.

To judge by their works these religious were true mystics. The contemplation they describe and at which they' aimed was of the noblest kind. They were at one with other teachers in regarding the *ascetic way* as entailing the practice of virtue, the religious life with all its renunciations and exercises according to the Rule oí St. Augustine, and liturgical prayer which forms one of the essential obligations of canons. But since they were scholars they also gave an ascetic character to their theological speculations which they used as an means to contemplation. This *use of study* for the purpose of prayer has given to rise the expression " speculative spirituality in reality, however, speculation by becoming mystical is made less abstract; it thus tends to become contemplative and often finds a powerful auxiliary in the shape of a superior and infused enlightenment that derives from contemplation in the true sense of the word.

This mystical tendency led the Canons Regular of St. Victor to evolve a method of more profound meditation, or of contemplative meditation, which, as regards its main outlines, was also adopted by St. Bonaventure' and St. Thomas3. It consists of a systematisation of St. Augustine's way of degrees4[5] The mind is raised more and more perfectly to God accordingly as it considers Him in His work (the world in itself, l) or the ordering of the world, II) in His created image (either sensible, in) or spiritual, i. e., the soul, iv) and lastly in His own nature, as known by faith (v) or in the Trinity of His Persons (vi)s. These considerations were regarded as being intuitive rather than discursive6 and from this it follows that true contemplation is to be found only in the two last degrees which also involve die

1 See above, p. 446.
9 See p. 615 sq. — 3 See p. 521.
4 Cf. vol. I, p. 670.
5 Richard oe St. Victor, *Benj. maj.*
6 The expression ""intuitive meditation" is due to Fr. Pourrat *[op. at.,* II, p. 174 sq.). We would prefer, though retaining the same meaning, " contemplative meditation". See vol. I, p. 26-27.

intervention of the highest graces [1] and even ecstasy. Yet the former degrees are not altogether unconnected with it, since " the consideration of created beings may lead to contemplation"; this consequence has ever been sought by true mystics, either in a popular form or by a more erudite method adapted to their intellectual culture. This "intuitive" prayer is chiefly meant for those Christians who possess a lively and enlightened faith. The profound mystical interests of the School of St. Victor gave rise to this systematisation *of* contemplative prayer. Their work has been completed by modern ascetics who have systematised the meditation of those who are beginning, or already advancing, in the spiritual life.

III. NEW SCHOOLS FOUNDED IN THE XHIth CENTURY.

A). Franciscan School.

Among the Orders that came into being in the XIIIth century, that of St. Francis, together with the Dominican Order, was the first to form a school of spirituality. From the outset it presented the elements of a clearly cut spirituality. *The tendency to contemplation* is also marked, though not more so than in the other schools : St. Francis had imbued his Order with the mystical spirit with which he himself was filled [3], and this was the mainspring of the supernatural joy he constantly urged. The truly distinctive characteacteristics of this spirituality, however, must be sought in the *means* employed to attain it, apart from the common and essential fund of all Catholic asceticism. These means may be reduced to four: I. absolute poverty, in keeping with the very letter of the Gospels; 2. a passionate love of Christ, considered in His human nature, especially in the mysteries of His Childhood and His Passion, for it is in Christ's human nature, more than in any other created thing, that is seen the goodness of God and His love for man: 3. love of nature, considered as the work of God and the expression of His beauty; 4. exemplarism [4] and rising to God according

[1] It is by means of these that may be attained a certain intuition of God, inferior, of course, to the beatific vision. (For Richard of St. Victor's opinion, see above, p. 454). There is also intuition — and therefore contemplation — in the first degrees, inasmuch as God is therein approached by means of a *simple regard* rather than by reasoning; but in these degrees the image in which He is perceived is much less pure than in the last degrees.

3P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 183.

[3] See E. GILSON, Za *philosophie de S. Bonaventure,* p. 71-75.

[4] Exemplarism is the philosophical doctrine on which love of nature is based. See p. 510.

to the Augustinian method, systematised by St. Bonaventure and generally adopted in the Franciscan school.

Saint Francis of Assisi (i 181-1226)[1] both on account of his life and the Order he founded, was one of the greatest spiritual teachers of the Church. He left but few writings[2].

Saint Bonaventure (d. 1274) well deserved the name of *Seraphic Doctor,* for, in spite of all that distinguishes him from St. Francis, he was filled with this spirit. Even his theology is affective and mystical. His ascetic treatises and those that deal with the religious life contain a teaching that is both profound and extremely practical[3]

The anonymous author of the *Meditationes vitee Christi',* greatly contributed by means of his colourful descriptions of the Passion to the development of the love of Jesus suffering and His sorrowful Mother. He was one of St. Bonaventure's disciples and for a long period his meditations were ascribed to the latter.

David of Augsburg (d. 1271) was the author of spiritual opuscula also attributed to St. Bonaventure : *De triplici statu religiosorum* (incipientium, proficientium, perfectorum)5; *De septeni processibus religiosi status* (fervor, labor, consolatio, tentatio, remedium, virtus et sapientia).

Blessed Angela of Foligno[6] (d. 1309) is chiefly known for her famous *book,* both autobiography and spiritual teaching; hence its title: *Visions and Revelations'*[7]. Born of a noble family, she first led a worldly life. Having been widowed and losing all her children by death, she gave up her wealth and lived as a penitent in the Franciscan Third Order at Foligno. She described the ordinary and extraordinary mystical favours she received. Her visions were mainly intellectual ; she stressed the transcendency of God. Union with God, characterised by a very special awareness of His presence, is accompanied by humility and sweetness and is likened to God's embracing *(amplcxatio)* of the soul. Angela also described the Passion in realist terms, but her thoughts were chiefly occupied by the Divine attributes.

Blessed Raymond Lulle[8] (d. 1315) who deserved the title of *Doctor illuminatus,* left several very valuable spiritual writings : *Liber de laudibus B. V. Murice; Liber contemplationum;* also perhaps the *Liber de amico et amato* (containing meditations for the whole year)[9].

1 P. Pourrat, *La spirit, chrit.,* 11, p. 230-260. E. Longpré, *Séraphiqut (esprit),* in *Diet. Apol.,* col. 1309-1320.

2 *Opuscula,* critical edition, Quaracchi, 1904.

3 See above, p. 504 sq. — 4 P. Pourrat, *ibid.,* p. 278-283.

5 Also entitled *De interioris et ext. hominis rejormalione,* or *Formula tinitiorum* (De institutione novitiorum).

6 P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 288-292. Cf. G. Delorme, in *Did. hist.,* col. 46-47.

7 In Hello's trans. (Paris, 1868). New trans., P. Doncœur (Paris, 1925) and M.-J. Ferré (Paris, 1927, with the title : *Le livre de Γexpérience des vrais fidèles).* The work was also published in 1538, entitled *Theologia Crucis.*

8 See aljove, p. 495.

9 A few others are mentioned bv A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 199-203.

B). Dominican School.

From the moment of its foundation the Dominican Order turned to study with a view to preaching. This, however, was not meant to prejudice *contemplation* in the eyes of the founder, who was himself a true ascetic and a great contemplative "able to speak only to God or of God ". It was obviously to this end that were ordained the austere practices imposed on the religious, as well as the choir office of the early monks. The future, indeed, was to see many great Dominican mystics, especially in Germany in the XIVth century. But the latter found their main inspiration in Dionysius the Areopagite who influenced them in a measure that was not usual in the Order. Among the more common and diaracteristic features of Dominican spirituality[1] should be noted : I. study, of a scientific nature, considered both as a means to holiness and as a preparation for preaching the Gospel, notably the study of speculative theology under the aegis of St. Thomas; 2. the Augustinian teaching on grace which, on the one hand, subjects man to the divine impulsion and exacts from him, on the other hand, the practice of virtue in the sense that the latter is brought to full perfection by docile submission to the guidance of the Holy Ghost; 3. lastly, doctrinal apostleship, either through theological teaching or by popular and scholarly preaching.

Saint Dominic (1170-1221) the founder of this spiritual movement, left no other writing than the *Constitutions* of his Order, modelled on those of the Premonstratensians.

St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) was the most potent factor in Dominican spirituality, despite the fact, that as a theologian, his teaching was mainly theoretical and speculative[3].

St. Albert the Great (d. 1280) was for a long time considered to be the author of the *Paradisus animez*[3] and the *De adhcerendo Deo*[4]; although these works are no longer ascribed to him, he wrote other works that closely regard spirituality[5].

St. Catherine of Sienna[6] (1347-1380) wielded enormous influence in the Church, even from a political viewpoint, because she was moved

[1] R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Le caractère et les principes de la spiritualité dominicaine,* in *Vie spirit.,* 1921 (v. iv), p. 365-384.

[2] See above, p. 613-622.

[3] An opusculum of the XIVth or xvth century. French trans, by P. Vanhamme, Saint-Maximin, 1921. — [4] See above, p. 695. — [5] See p. 4S9.

[6] F. Pourrat. *op. cit.,* p. 309-318. See especially *Vie spirituelle,* 1923 (vol. vin), p. 5-146. Series of articles on the Saint's development, apostolato, works and teaching. Bibliography p. 141-146.

by the Spirit of God, as is witnessed by her writings, especially her *Letters* (business letters and letters of spiritual guidance) and the *Dialogue GSl^Y'* hier life is also known to us from the narrations of her director and biographer, Blessed Raymond of Capua'. Inspired by grace she made a vow of virginity while still a child; at the age of sixteen she entered the Dominican Third Order and soon attained the highest summits of the interior life; it was then (about 1370) that she began to use her apostolic influence for the reform of the Church and the sanctification of souls. All her *doctrine* tends to this twofold end. In the *Dialogue,* the Eternal Father converses with the saint, replies to her petitions and shows her His will ; condemnation of vice alternates with exhortations to virtue and the most sublime contemplations. Knowledge of God and of self forms the starting point of the whole work. Though the latter is in no way didactic, it is easy to find therein the three stages of the way of perfection, perfection itself forming a fourth degree in which a particularly lasting and intimate union witi God is attained : then, the soul, transfigured by grace, savours the presence of God, without however seeing Him in His essence. The Saint's writings reveal how deeply she was influenced by the Dominican masters[3], but her own influence, both in the Order and in the Church was even more far-reaching.

St. Vincent Ferrier (1346-1419) is chiefly known as a popular preacher, gifted with extraordinary elocjuence; but he also wrote an ascetic masterpiece in the little spiritual directory that he composed for the religious of his Order, entitled *De vita spirituali^*.

IV. THE DIONYSIAN SCHOOL IN THE XIVth CENTURY.

A). The great Dionysian School.

In Germany and the Netherlands during the XIVth century flourished a spirituality that was particularly sensitive to the influence of Dionysius the Areopagite; hence the name we give it here in preference to the more usual *German School.* Its beginnings must be looked for in the Dominican Order. As we have already mentioned, a group of Dominican philosophers remained loyal to Neoplatonism, even alter St. ThomasS. This movement, in the XIVth century was given a mystical tendency in the writings of some authors,

1 *Letters,* Fr. trans., E. Carlier, i860; *Dialogue,* trans., P. llurtaud, 1913. The *prayers* (26 of these) are a collection of statements made by the Saint during her ecstasies and written down by her hearers.

- Raymond of Capua or *Des Vignes* (1330-1399) author of the *Vita Sonda Catherines S.* (called *Legenda major},* a doctrinal as well as historical work, became Master General of the Order in 1380.

3 " The *Summa* of St. Thomas is plainly seen in certain chapters (of the Dialogue)". P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 314. The use of abstract expressions, Truth, Deity, Goodness, is also to be explained by the intellectual nature of the Saini's visions.

4 Trans., P. Rousset, 1S99 and P. Bernadot, 1918. — 5 See above, p. 637-638.

but was almost discredited by the rashness of Eckhart, to whom its beginning is due.

i. Master Eckhart[x] (1260-1327) born at Hochleim near Gotha entered the order as a young man, became a Doctor at Paris where he taught for two periods, before becoming provincial of Saxony. He enjoyed great doctrinal authority at the beginning of the XIVth century by reason of his Latin philosophical treatises and by his preaching on spiritual and mystical matters. His work is only partly extant (in poor condition) and consists chiefly of sermons*. His ideas were bold and in 1326 he was denounced to the Archbishop of Cologne who censured 28 propositions drawn from his Latin writings. He appealed to the Holy Sec but died before a decision was promulgated. In 1329 the Archbishop's sentence was confirmed by John XXII who declared 17 propositions lobe heretical and 11 others suspect. In recent times Eckhart's orthodoxy has been very competently pleaded[3] and there is no doubt that his intentions were perfectly sincere; his expressions, however, were undoubtedly ambiguous and his principles contained the seeds of Pantheism.

Eckhart's teaching is still only imperfectly understood. It would nevertheless seem evident that he can only have been regarded as a true Pantheist by interpreting his expressions that treat of the mystical union of the soul with God in a purely natural and philosophical sense[4]. Eckhart was a mystic and this is seen in his philosophy. We may even conjecture that the latter is based entirely on a mystical foundation[5]. On the other hand, however, his building was faulty and it would be rash to claim that his work fits perfectly into the scholastic background and still more that it is free of error. The condemned propositions are truly there[6] and must be rejected in their obvious meaning[7]. Such are the articles teaching the transformation of man into God[8], the uncreatedness of a part of the soul[9], the identification of the good man with

[x] F. Vernet, *Eckart,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2057-20S1. G. Théry, *Le procès L'Eckart,* in *Vie spirit.* (Supplement) 1923 sq. (vol. IX sq.), a series of articles. 0. Karrer, *Meister Eckchart. Das System seiner teligiosen Lehie it. Lebensweisheit,* Munich, 1926. Cf. G. THÉRY, in *Rev. sc. phil. théol.,* 1927, p. 236-240. Other recent studies, *ibid.*

1 Edited by Pfeifer *(Deutsche Mystiker d. XIV/.,* Leipsic, 1845 and 1S75, 2 vols, no serins., treatises...), Sievers, etc. Denifle has published fragments of the 3rd part of the *Opus tripartitum* (i. e., *Opus propositionum ; Opus qu<c-slionum; Opus expositionum) ; M. E. Laleinische Schrijnen,* i8S6.

3 Denifle, Karrer, *op. cit.,* Fr. Théry maintains the justice of his condemnation.

4 We may add "nationalist" with a view to underlining lhe "germanio" character of Eckhart "the great grandson of Buddha, the father of Jacob Boerne, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer What myths! " (G. Théry).

3 Brief philosophical synthesis in M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 118-125.

' A Dominican critic has recently controlled their exactness with reference to new texts. G. Théry, *Edit, critiq.,* In *Arch. d'Hist. doct.* I, 1926.

7 Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion,* n. 501-529. Cf. F. Vernet, *op. cit.*

6 Nos transformamur totaliter in Deum et convertimur in eum, simili modo, sicut in sacramento panis convertitur in Corpus Christi (pr. 10).

9 Aliquid est in anima quod est increatum et increabile (pr. 27).

the only-begotten Son of God', etc. From the moral viewpoint, several propositions lead to Quietism : the gioì y of God is shewn forth in sin, as in good, the blasphemer praises God by his sin2; true contrition does not consist in desiring not to have sinned3; we must remain indifferent even as regards heaven and holiness45

2. Much more prudent and sound is the spiritual teaching of the other great Dionysians, Eckhart's disciples in Germany, and Ruysbroek who was influenced by them in the Netherlands. It still retains its powerful originality and has never been condemned by the Church, though it has known many adversaries. As in all the medieval schools it possesses a strong *mystical tendency :* Tauler and Suso preach the highest graces to all the faithful, a doctrine that is not without its drawbacks 5. As regards the means of attaining this mystical union, they especially recommend, in addition to the ordinary Christian ascesis : I. total exterior and interior renunciation of self, in the steps of the crucified Christ6;72. the use, in the order of knowledge, of the negative method, which prescinds from the sovereignly transcendent God all the imperfections and even the perfections of creatures : God is greater than we can conceive and in the nakedness of the intelligence man knows Him the best; in these obscurities the divine, infused, and supernatural light shines out. The Dionysian teaching is recognisable in these expressions7. It is still more evident in the explanation of the *union with God8,* conceived as the soul's return to the One, its source. This union takes place in the essence of the soul rather than in its faculties and is accomplished *without any intermediary,* uniting the soul to the divine essence rather than to the Persons, although union with the Persons follows in souls transfigured by grace. In its highest degree the union (called *superessential')* is *without difference,* an expression which, to the mind of the authors we have mentioned, does not involve destruction of the personality 9.

John Tauler (1290-1361) Alsatian (born and died at Strasburg), a Dominican from the age of 18, was one of the greatest preachers of his

' Prop. 20. Cf. 21-22. —2 Prop. 4, 5, 6. — 3 Prop. 14. — 4 Prop. S.

5 For, even if no-one is excluded in theory, it in no wise follows that all arc ready to hear and truly understand such a doctrine, and capable ol profiting by it.

6 P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 346-378.

7 Despite the scholastic explanations that may be found for it.—8 *Ibid.,* p. 361-378.

9 These expressions remain no less difficult to understand, and great authors such as Gerson and Bossuet have called them exaggerated. Though one cannot affirm the absolute impossibility of such gifts, it must be admitted that they are in the highest degree exceptional and extraordinary.

time as well asan outstanding director of souls. His spiritual teaching is to be found in his *Sermons*[1]*and also — though summarised by another hand — in the *Institutions'*] that bear his name.

Blessed Henry Suso (1295-1365) born in Swabia, sometime prior of the Dominicans of Constance, is chiefly renowned for his devotion to the Divine Wisdom, which forms the centre of his spirituality and which brought him great mystical favours. His chief writings are: *The Book of Eternal Wisdom* (treating especially of Christ's sufferings for sin); *The Book of Truth* trefutation of the Beghards and a mystical explanation of Dionysian inspiration). These writings together with a short collection of *Letters* and his *Life* (written by a nun, his spiritual daughter) form the *Exemplar*[3] (due to the author). Suso led an extremely austere life and underwent great trials, notably a suspicion of being unorthodox.

Blessed John Ruysbroek[4] (1293-1381) born in the neighbourhood of Brussels, chaplain of Ste-Gudule, withdrew, at the age of 50, to the forest of Soignes to the hermitage called Vauvert (Val-vert, Groenendael) which became a priory of Canons Regular of St. Augustine and a centre of his spiritual influence. He has left a dozen treatises no less remarkable for their piety than for their profundity which earned the title of "Admirable" for their author. The most famous is the *Spiritual Espousals,* describing the active life (bk. 1), the interior or affective life (bk. 11) and the superessential contemplative life (bk. in). The mystical union is again explained in the *Mirror of Eternal Salvation* (the soul, image of God), the *Kingdom of the Lovers of God* (on the gifts of the Holy Ghost) and the *Book of the Highest Truth* (explains the foregoing work). Among those that treat of the means of contemplation, are the *Book ofthe Seven Enclosures* (or renunciations), the *Twelve Virtues.* The *Four Temptations* is a vigorous refutation of the Pantheism of the " Brethren of the Free Spirit"[5].

B). Moderate Dionysian School.

The influence of Dionysius is also recognisable in an English spiritual work of the XIVth century (middle), the

'Latin trans., Surius, Cologne, 1603; French, (after Surius), Noel, 8 vols, Paris, 1911-1913. E. HUGUENY, *La docl. myst. de T.,* in *Rev. sc. ph. th.,* 1921, p. 195-221.

'Newed., Paris, 1909. Copious extracts in A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 203-219.

3 German ed., Denifle, *Die Schriften des hl. H. Suso,* Munich, 1S76-1880: other German edits, Bihi.meyer, 1907, Heller, 1926.

4 Mgr Waffelaert, *L'union de Pâme avec Dieu* (trans. R. Hoornaert), DOM J. IIUYBEN, *Le Bxf. R. —Son rôle et sa doctrine,* in *Vie spirit.,* 1922 (vol. vi), p. 100-114. Early life by J. Pomerius, in *An. Boll.,* 1885 (vol. iv), p. 26359. P. O'Sheridan, *Ce qui reste de la... vie de R.,* in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.* 1925 (2 arts); contrary opinion by J. IIUYBEN, in *Vie spirit.,* 1925 (vol. vu), p. 236-240. A. Vauthier d'Aygallîers, *Ruysbroek ΓA.,* Paris, 1923 (Qualifications by G. Théry, in *Rev. sc. ph. th.,* 1926, p. 264-266).

5 On the numerous Flemish authors who centre around Ruysbroek see the study (in Flemish) by Fr. Van Mierlo, S. J. in *Academie flam.,* Ghent, 1926). Cf. P. Groult „*Les mystiques des Pays-Bas et la littéral, espagnole,* Louvain, 1927.

Cloud of Unknowing x, recently published[2], its mysticism, however, is far more moderate than that of the foregoing authors. Its chief originality seems to lie in its outstanding insistence on the co-opcration man must give to divine action, preparing and adapting himself to it in order to be perfectly united to God 3. The unknown author follows Dionysius, St. Augustine, The School of St. Victor (he translated Richard's *Benjamin minor),* and St. Bernard. He appears to have written before Walter Hilton (d. 1396) who was possibly his disciple and the author of the *Scala perfectionis.* He was a Canon Regular of St. Augustine. The Imitation has been ascribed to him on insufficient grounds. Hilton provides an excellent reflection of English spirituality at the end of the Xivth century 5.

V. SCHOOLS AT THE END OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

The Xivth century saw the growth, often within the same country, of schools of an essentially affective and practical nature alongside those of a very marked mystical tendency. This was in no way due to lack of interest in contemplation, but rather to an ardent desire to attain it by the surest and most practical means. These schools, therefore, are not differentiated so much by their doctrines as by their methods, which we will outline briefly below.

A). School of Windesheim.

The so called Windesheim School6 is especially famous for having given to the world that classical masterpiece, the *Imitation.* Its founder was Gerard Groot (1340-1384', born in the Netherlands (Deventer), Master of Arts of Paris. Together with FLORENS Radewijns (1350-1400) he founded a Congregation comprising the *Brethren of the Common Lot* and *Canons Regular,* having for their base the town of

1 Γνόφο τή αγνωσία , says Dionysius, *Theol. myst.,* r, 3.

' Fr. trans. Dom M. Noetinger, Tours, 1925. Preface-Introduction, p. 5-48. The edition contains four other treatises of the same nature.

3 The *Cloud* studies the nature of the contemplative's work (ch. 1-25), its conditions (c. 26-44) and the illusions to be avoided (c. 45-75).

Eng. trans., Dom Guy, London, 1869.

s At the beginning of the century is found Richard Rolle (d. 13-49) of Hampoole, probably an Augustinian, author of several spiritual writings, notably ascetic. Cf. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* vol. 11, 564.

e P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 378-349.

Windesheim (between Deventer and Zwolle). Possessing brilliant copyists, the school trained remarkable ascetic authors, much given to compiling *sententice :* their favourite task was the forming of valuable collections of spiritual works[1] with a view to encouraging an affective and practical piety.

The better known of these authors are : Gerlac Peters (1378-1411) author of a *Soliloquium**, akin to the *Imitation,* and Thomas a Kempis [2] (1379-1471) sub-prior of Windesheim, where he was ordained in 1413 or 1414. He composed a large number of ascetical writings[4] which earned him an outstanding place among the writers of his school. "In his opuscula and his sermons, Thomas a Kempis treats of the monastic life and its virtues[5], the interior life[6], the life and Passion of Christ[7], the Virgin Mary, and lastly the mystical union[8]. They contain no theorising. The doctrine is invariably set out in an even and simple way in the form of counsels or maxims"[9].

The Imitation of Jesus Christ is one of the most pleasing *spiritual guides* ever written. Its title, taken from book I, corresponds only imperfectly to its contents. The work comprises four treatises, probably independent at the outset, but now forming a complete whole. Book in would seem to indicate the apex of the interior life *(Liber internee consolationis);* The first two books contain counsels apt to lead thereto; general counsels *(Admonitiones ad spiritualem vitam utiles,* bk. 1) and more particular counsels in view of the interior life *(Adm. ad interna trahentes,* bk. 11). Book in is devoted to a more particular means of holiness, yet is outstandingly important : *Eucharistic Communion* [10]. Both the method and the doctrine of the work correspond perfectly to what is known of the School of Windesheim. Furthermore, the manuscripts, even the earliest (dating from 1421 and 1424) establish the Windesheim origin of this spiritual masterpiece. Its ascription to Thomas a Kempis is becoming ever more generally admitted, to the exclusion of other suggested authors, not only the problematic Benedictine abbot John Gerson (xmth cent) ", but also the Chancellor John Gerson ", The hesitation of the critics in this matter is due to the

[1] The anonymous collections were slily called *Rapiaria.*

[2] Fr. trans., by Dom E. Assemaine, *Iλ Soliloque enflammé.*

[3] From Kempen, in the region of Dusselfdorf (Rhineland).

* Critic, edit., M. J. Pohl, *Opera oninia,* 7 vols, Freiburg, 1904-1910.

[5] *Liber de tribus tabernaculis; Libellus spiritualis exercitii;* etc.

[6] *De vera compunctione; De solitudine et silentio* etc.

i Various meditations, prayers and sermons.

[8] *Soliloquium animee; Hortulus rosarum; Vallis liliorum; De elevatione mentis; Cantica.* " Thomas a K. admirably sings of the mystical union... His song recalls that of the Imitation and the Xiith century mystics ". P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 391. — [9] P. Pourrat, *ibid.,* p. 3S7-38S.

[10] Very methodical doctrinal explanation by Dumas, *L'Imit. de J.O.,* Paris, 1913.

[«] Mabillon's opinion and also of several early Benedictines.

["] Mgr Puyol's opinion. He has written several volumes on this subject. Very copious bibliography.

large extracts made by the author from early writers and particularly St. Bernard *.

B). Carthusian School.

The Carthusian Order which for two centuries had mainly preached spirituality by its example, adopted a new form of apostolate in the shape of the written word in the XIVth century. Its doctrinal activity was, as may be supposed, *mystical* in its tendency, yet the practical, affective, and *ascetic* interest remained supreme, in keeping with the tradition that went back to the beginnings and which was certainly strengthened by St. Bernard. The influence of two authors was predominant : *Lzidolph* and *Denys.* The latter lived in the XVth century, but his teaching undoubtedly belongs to the Middle Ages: "Denys admirably brings to an end the ascetic and mystical Middle Ages. He sums them up most attractively, for he is a great affective"[1].

Ludolph of Saxony, called the Carthusian (1300-1370) prior of the Carthusian monastery of Strasburg, obtained immense popularity by his *Life of Our Lord,* an ascetic and spiritual rather than historical work. It contains personal meditations and Patristic extracts, meant to excite a love of Christ in his pious readers. The work began to be neglected when the need for reaction against Protestantism exacted the use of a stricter method[3].

Denys the Carthusian[4], (1402-1473) was the foremost ascetic writer of his school. He combined the highest form of contemplative life (he was called the *Ecstatic Doctor)* with intense literary activity:[5] he was philosopher, theologian and exegete. He also commented Dionysius the Areopagite and composed mystical treatises : *De fonte lucis et semitis vitee; De contemplatione; De discretione spirituum.* Like earlier writers, he associates contemplation with the gift of wisdom and already distinguishes an " active " form of this prayer. The greater part of his spiritual work, however, is *ascetic* and deals with the more usual means of holiness and salvation : conversion, prayer, temptations, interior joy and peace etc. He made no attempt to be original but rather to be useful by reproducing what was best in early writers[6].

1 Innumerable other *anonymous spiritual writings* of a *practical* character which appeared in the Middle Ages were also inspired by St. Bernard and St. Augustine. P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 440 466.

3 P. 1'OURRAT, *op. cit.,* p. 477. — 3 *Ibid.,* p. 470-473.

4 Also called Denys of Rijckel (Belgian Limburg), his birthplace.

5The early edition of his works contains 44 vols in-40, new ed., begun in 1S96.

6 Among the Carthusian spiritual writers of the following century we should mention John Lansperge (d. 1539) author of the very pious *Entretiens def. C. avec l'âme,* a devout lover of the Sacred Heart, influenced by St. Gertrude (whose Revelations he caused to be published), and L. Surius (1522-1578) who was not only a great editor of early works (acts of the councils, Patristic homilies, etc. ', but also a talented *hagiographer* whose work greatly contributed to the spread of a sound spirituality.

C) Doctrine of Gerson [*].

In the true sense of the word, Gerson does not represent a school nor does his interesting spiritual work possess the powerful originality of the true masters. He nevertheless systematised the traditional spirituality better than any of his forerunners. He was especially on the alert against the false mystics whose number was legion at the time[2], and his love of orthodoxy sometimes led him to look upon the bold but nevertheless sound conceptions of the Dionysian School as exaggerated. He therefore laid down very precise rules for the discernment of spirits [3]. The essentials of his spiritual teaching are found in his *Mystical Theology* [4], but it is completed in two other great treatises [5] and a considerable number of spiritual opuscula. It will be enough here to give the general outline of his chief work, and first its *speculative part*** followed by the *practical applications* that accompany it.

His theory of contemplation is based on sound psychology. The soul *sees,* either through the eye of the body or through the eye of the reason, or the spiritual eye of the intelligence *(intelligentia simplex).* The soul is moved to act by the sensitive appetite, the reasonable appetite and the higher appetite, or synderesis (which guides the soul by means of the first practical principles)[7]. The soul's actions are classified according to this hierarchy : the acts of the mind arc thought, meditation, and contemplation (a simple regard of the higher intelligence), and those of the appetite are passion, devotion (deliberate), and love (a simple and perfect act of the higher appetite)[8]. Mystical theology is both understanding and love, for in perfect souls these two acts are combined : there is no contemplation without love. Mystical theology is an experimental knowledge of God achieved in the intimacy of unitive love [9].

[*] L. Saleminer, *Gerson,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1324-1327. A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu...,* p. 233-245. P. Pourrat, *Spiritualité chrét.,* 11, p. 403-429. — a P. POURRAT, *op. cit.,* p. 407-418.

[3] *De examinatione doctrinarum ; De probatione spirituum ; De distinctione verarum visionum afalsis.* — [4] *Theologia mystica speculativa et practica.*

[5] *Eclaircissement scolastique de la théologie mystique* and *La Montagne de la contemplation* (in French).

[6] For Gerson "mystical theology" means "contemplation", and "mystical speculative theology" the theoretical study of contemplation and the mystical graces, in the modern sense of the expression "mystical theology", i. e., in practice, that theology which deals with the higher asceticism which is meant for mystical souls.

[7] Gerson considers synderesis to be an appetitive faculty though most authors regard it as an " habitus " of the intelligence.

[8] *Th. myst. spec.,* consid. 26-27.

[9] *Ibid., c.* 31.

This experimentalis Dei perceptio transcends all reasoning and even all speculative and scientific theology based on reason. It is the consummation of the work of the moral virtues which purify the soul, the theological virtues which enlighten it and the beatific virtues (gifts?) that perfect it'. It is not, therefore, reserved to theologians alone; on the contrary, modest and humble souls come to it more easily than do the learned, whose intellectual pride often prevents them from savouring contemplative love[2]. The characteristics of this love consist in ravishing[3] the soul in God, uniting it with Him[4] and contenting it by means of a deep and peaceful joy[5].

More characteristic perhaps than his spiritual teaching, is Gerson's practical mysticism which lays clown "the preparatory conditions and means of mystical contemplation"[6]. These means, which he terms *industries,* contain a whole scheme of *higher asceticism.* Thus, contemplation is meant not for beginners or those who advance, but for perfect souls *(industria i);* one's temperament *(i'nd. 2)* and condition *(ind. 3),* must be taken into account; it is meant especially for those who must tend to perfection *(ind. 4.).* Those who wish to prepare themselves for contemplation must avoid a multiplicity of occupations or at least of interests *(ind. g),* temper curiosity *(ind. 6),* practise patience *(ind. γ),* and keep a tight rein on the affections *(ind. 8).* It is recommended as an immediate preparation to make a careful choice of a fitting time and place for prayer *(ind. p),* to practise mortification in food and sleep, to avoid all excess of commission and omission *(ind. 10),* to guide one's thoughts to love *(ind. τι)* and lastly to simplify[7] one's faith in order to attain to a very pure idea of God *(¿nd. 12).* This mystical asceticism of course implies the *ordinary* essential *asceticism* based on the Christian virtues: it nevertheless forms its necessary complement and the chancellor did not hesitate to urge it on his sisters who had remained in the world, though they had never married[8].

Among the means that pave the way to contemplation, Gerson counsels meditation, to which he devotes an excellent opusculum'.

' *Ibid.,* c. 30. — 2 *Ibid.,* c. 31.

3 Ravishment (c. 36-39) is an absorption in God, which, in its higher forms culminates in ecstasy.

4 *Ibid.,* c. 40-41. — 5 *Ibid.,* c. 42.

6 L. Salembier, *op. cit.,* col. 1326, after the *Theol. myst. pract.*

1 Cf. *De simplificatione, stabilitione sen mundificatione cordis.*

8 In the *Montagne de la contemplation* which sets out the same teaching. Chaps. 37-39 of this fine work contain interesting suggestions for meditation and prayer. — ' *Tractatus consolatorius de meditatione.*

"The goal of mystical meditation should always be the development of divine love and devotion. In this it differs from purely scientific meditation and is more akin to our modern meditation which combines prayer and reflection.—Gerson lays down no rules for meditation, everyone must seek the way that is best adapted to his temperament, and ask his director's advice... Meditation leads to contemplation; it is the necessary intermediary, without which, and saving a miracle, contemplation cannot be achieved" [1].

As a whole, the spiritual teaching of Gerson is a faithful image of the intermediate nature of the epoch during which it was elaborated. It is an *echo of the past.* For much of his material the author drew upon St. Augustine, St. Bernard, the Victorines, St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure and William of Paris[2]. Though not neglecting Dionysius the Areopagite, he was distrustful of the exaggerated teachings of contemporary Dionysians[3]. He was extremely hard on the false mystics and even elaborated a complete doctrine for the discernment of spirits, foreshadowing the rules of St. Ignatius[4]. In this, as well as in his study of mysticism as a theological matter, he was a *pioneer.* The brilliance of later spiritual Masters should not be allowed to throw him into the shade.

[1] P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 427.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 420.
[3] See above, p. 704.
[4] See p. 709, n. 3. Cf. A. Chollet, *Discernement des esprits,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1390-1391. P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 407-418.

SECOND PART

THE RENAISSANCE

CHAPTER I.

The Renaissance and the Reformation.

Special Bibliography : (for the whole chapter).

J. Guiraud, *DEglise et les origines de la Renaissance,* Paris, 1902. A. Baudrillart, *LEglise cath., la Renaissance, le Protestantisme,* Paris, 1904. J. Janssen, *Geschichte d. deutschen Volkes,* 1879 sq. fr. edit., *DAllemagne et la Réforme,* 6 vol., Paris, 1889-1902. H. DeNIFLE, *Luther u. Lutherturn,* 1904-1909 (PaquieP s trans., Paris, 4 vols.) II. Grisar, *Luther,* 3 vols, Freiburg, 1911-1912. L. Cristiani, *Luther et le luthéranisme,* Paris, 1908. Other various studies and lastly art. *Réforme,* in *Diet. Apol,,* col. 582-647. J. Paquier, *Luther,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 1146-1335. H. Bremond, *Hist, littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de religion jusqu'à nos jours,* Paris, 1921 sq. ; monumental work, now reached the Vlllth yol., 1928; the 1st vol. *(DHumanisme dévot,* 1921) is a kind of introduction, extremely thought-provoking. See also M. DE Wulf, *Hist, delaphil. médiévale,* vol. II, p. 243-295.

I. HUMANISM.

The systematisation of Patristic thought which began in the Middle Ages was continued in the XVlth century under the influence of those intellectual movements which are known as the Renaissance and the Reformation. The danger of ascribing ideas to the Fathers which, in reality, were very alien to them, may be avoided by noting that these intellectual currents brought with them something quite new, as regards at least their way of viewing the old problems. And in this respect the Renaissance is quite as important as the Reformation.

Not that the Renaissance was simply a throwback to the origins of Christianity ; rather was it a return to classical Græco-Roman art; it envisaged, furthermore, Beauty rather than 1 ruth; Form in preference to Matter. Yet even this

should not be disregarded by the Christian. The Renaissance in this respect formed a usefid corrective to sober medieval austerity. By encouraging the observation of *nature* as one of the sources of art, it expressed a profoundly Christian concept. "The Middle Ages, by closing its eyes to human and physical nature, had dried up one of the sources of artistic inspiration; the abuse of symbolism ended by giving a frigid character to its conventional and often Unintelligible art; too much idealism and contempt of style had made of it an hieratic and ugly thing...1. When the Renaissance, peering into antiquity, re-discovered nature, it did not necessarily fall foul of the Christian inspiration. Lon0" before the Commentaries of Pius II had exalted the countryside of the Alban Hills and the Amiata, the books of Holy Writ had magnificently sung the praises of physical nature. And as for human nature with all the psychological, metaphysical and moral problems that it involves, it was studied by the Fathers of the Church with an exactness and perception that was never surpassed by the Renaissance of Erasmus, Machiavelli and Guicciardini. Christianity, of course, always insisted that in nature should be preserved the hierarchy so eloquently defined by Pascal when he described the grandeurs of the flesh, and of the spirit, and the infinitely nobler impulsions of charity" 2.

Humanism, whose object is literary beauty, has a closer connection with religion and morality than any of the other arts. It is impossible to clothe ideas in a pleasing dress, without making the philosophical or moral ideal expressed by these ideas in some degree attractive. Yet the ideal of antique literature was too much opposed to the Christian vision, not to give rise to friction. It threatened to paganise men's minds by the unreserved *optimism* it proposed, a concept that was shared by far too many of the humanists, even those who were closest to the popes. "Whilst the Church was preaching the fall of man, his irremediable natural weakness, and his need of divine aid, humanism, having become pagan, proclaimed the goodness of nature and

1 "If the sculptures of our Gothic Cathedrals and the works of the Italian Primitives are awkward and disproportioned, despite an occasional felicity of expression, it is because nature was not sufficiently studied by an art which gave not only a preponderating but also an exclusive importance to the Christian ideal". J. Guiraud, *op. cit.,y.* 288.

2 J. Guiraud, *op. cit.,* p. 288-289.

deified man. Whilst the Church was giving a supernatural reason and goal to human life, and seeing the end of our destiny in God, humanism, having become pagan, restrained the ideal of life to this world and to man himself"[1]. Nor was any halt called after this declaration of principles; the practical consequences were deduced. The Pagan philosophers who had summed up all morality in the brief precept *sequere naturam,* were avidly listened to at the Renaissance, nor was it always "the laws of universal conscience", nor the "noble instincts of the individual" that the humanists understood by nature, but only too often every instinct, even the most gross [2]. No doubt, true scholars knew how to combine a love of classical literature with the purest spirit of Christianity [3]; but they were the exception, especially at the end of the XVth century. We should be overlooking the complex nature of the Renaissance were we to consider it as being essentially hostile to the faith and moral teaching of Christ; at the time, however, the natural, human aspirations which it excited were too violent not to bring, at least in retrospect, a forgetfulness of the supernatural realities.

Reason necessarily played a great part in this glorification of nature. The conceit of a number of scholars possessed no limit, since the art of fine writing brought all honours within their grasp and certain critical researches enabled them to undermine, sometimes with justice, historical positions which until then had seemed firmly established and impregnable. They began to think they could arraign all things at the court of reason, even in the domain of the faith. Their audacity was all the more serious inasmuch as Occamism had already found a secure footing in the Universities for its astoundingly new teachings on the relation between reason and faith [4]. To their eyes, "reason must hold undisputed sway, reason can accomplish all things and in consequence no limit may be put to it. Revelation is but a hindrance and an absurdity. Then began, both openly and deviously, positive attacks on Christianity. Already Petrarch was bemoaning the fact that to make open profession of Christian faith and regard it as greater than pagan philosophy was enough to gain a reputation for folly and ignorance... Among the humanists some treated Christianity with contempt and refrained from referring to it... others, more bold, ridiculed it, seeing dogmas merely as worn-out ideas, incapable of contributing to progress and fit for rejection" [5]. All scoffed at the old *Scholasticism,* but "on the pretext of changing a method, they attained its very core and demolished piecemeal the whole of Catholic theology"[6].

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 296. — [2] *Ibid.,* p. 295-302. — [3] *Ibid.,* p. 294, 314-322.
[4] See above, p. 663-666.
[5] A. Baudrillart, *op. cit.,* p. 23-24. — [6] *Ibid.,* p. 24.

With no less ruthlessness they attacked the religious, especially the mendicants *(frati)* whose ideal of mortification, authority and sound doctrine they despised Such rationalism was not inseparable from humanism as was evidenced by the example of several of the more eminent representatives of the latter[2]; but it was consonant with the tendencies of the XVth century, even among the clergy, and more especially among the secretaries of the pontifical court.

Philosophy profited little by this clamorous and confused fermentation of ideas. These *rhetors,* so swift to criticise, so easily witty and superior at the expense of Peripatetic Philosophy, found themselves unable to build anew. Their attempts, says M. de Wulf "were laughable. The basic idea of their philosophy was the reduction of philosophy to dialectics, and of dialectics to rhetoric. They confused the knowledge of things with the art of reasoning, and the art of reasoning with the art of the well-turned phrase. To their eyes the greatest philosophers were Cicero and Quintilian, for these were the greatest of the rhetors" [3]. Not all Renaissance philosophical effort, however, was limited to this, and the following widely differentiated speculative systems that it inspired should be noted.

The study of nature led certain minds to a veritable speculative naturalism[4]. Leonardo da Vinci (d. 1519) a physicist of genius as well as an artist, was wary of rash theorising. Doctors of medicine, however, such as Paracelsus (d. 1541) attempted to base their art on theology blended with philosophy, and magic or cabalistic teachings. TELESIUS (d. 1588) created a real system, based on natural physical forces, in which cold and heat take the place of the Aristotelian form, and help to explain the composition of bodies, the origins of minerals, the formation of living things and even the human soul, which, he says, is but "a spirit, more refined and more subtile than that of the animal, but possessing the same nature" [5]. Others added to this system in their own manner and some arrived at a pure Pantheism : Patrizzi (d. 1597) and Giordano Bruno (d. 1600). Even coarser in texture was the naturalism of Francis Bacon (d. 1626) the theoretician of utilitarian and atheistic materialism [6].

During the Renaissance, **Platonism**[7] came once again into favour. Florence, while Cosmo and Lorenzo de Medici were in power, was the chief centre of the movement. The principal protagonist was a Greek, G. Gemistos, known as Plethon (d. 1450) who took part in the business of the Council of Florence and persuaded the court of the

[1] Cf. J. Guiraud, *op. cit.,* p. 306 sq. — [2] See below, p. 724.
[3] M. de Wulf, *Hist. de la phil. mid.,* II, p. 248.
[4] Cf. *Ibid.,* p. 256-260. — [5] M. de Wulf, *ibid.,* p. 258.
[6] It was this atheism that won Voltaire's tribute when he called him "The Father of modern philosophy", despite his mediocrity in speculation and in the sciences. — [7] M. de Wulf, *ibid.,* p. 250-252.

Medici to found an Academy of *Platonic Philosophy*. The most outstanding master was Marsilio Ficino who translated his favourite philosophers (Plato, Plotinus) from Greek into Latin, and summarised their teaching in original treatises. This work, which has not endured, was lacking in objectivity and the Academy itself fell with the Medici'. Despite a certain similarity, it is difficult to admit that Cartesian idealism was a consequence of the Platonism of the Renaissance.

The followers of Aristotle who were at one in denying intellectual pre-eminence to Plato[2], differed among themselves in interpreting their master. At Padua they were *Averroists*[3], with Al. Achillinus (d. 1518), Aug. Niphus (d. 1546) and A. Zimara (d. 1532), *Alexandria* at Bologna where POMPONAZZI (d. 1525) set up the authority of the early Roman commentator Alexander of Aphrodisias (iind cent. B. C.) against that of Averroes. "The immortality of the soul was the main theme of their discussions. For the Averroists, immortality is impersonal ; for the Alexandrists, the human soul perishes entirely with the body, just as the form disappears with the dissolution of a compound. For both, there is neither Providence nor freewill. In both camps, those who still desired to safeguard dogma—and they were a minority-had recourse to the theory of two truths. The \7th Lateran Council in 1513[4] condemned as heretical the doctrine of the two truths, as well as the theory of the universal human intellect and the mortality of the soul"[5]. At Padua and Bologna the Dominican doctors defended *Thomist* Aristotelianism which ended by carrying all before it[6].

One of the philosophical creations that best embodied the spirit of the Renaissance was Theism, a kind of purified natural religion, based on spiritism and glorifying an enlightened humanism. At the beginning of the XVth century[7], Plethon made himself its prophet and found his gospel in the writings of Platon. At bottom, this seems to be no other than the philosophy of Erasmus[8] (cl. 1536) : he kept the faith, no doubt, and remained loyal to the Church, but he was shy of all dogmatism and detested " the whole of medieval theology, men and things, its spirit and form, method and conclusions"; for him "true theology" is *u the philosophy of Christ"** and "the purified teaching of Christ is identical with the religion of Plato, Cicero and Seneca"[10]. His moral teaching owed much to the Stoics; it was in no wise anti-Christian, but the spirit that gave it life was more human than supernatural, and therein lies its irremediable weakness. The same must be said of several other famous humanists, such as Reuchlin

1 Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (d. T494) combined neoplatonic Greek Philosophy with cabalistic theories in his *Conclusiones nonçentæ in omni gentrt scientiarum*. These were all condemned by Innocent VIII. (Denzinger-R, *Ench. Sym.,* n. 736). The young scholar humbly submitted, retracted and shortly afterwards died, wearing the habit of St. Dominic. Hurter, *Nomenci.,* II, 1010-1014. For Ficino, cf. *ibid.,* col. 1014-1017.

3 See a number of names in M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 253.

3 See Hurter, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 1280-1283. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* it,

1 Penziî*ger-B., η· 73& — 5 M. de Wulf, 0/>. *cit.y* p. 254.

c See below, p. 740. — 7 See above, p. 715.

Erasing DicL· théol.y col. 388-397. See below, p. 724.

9 c°b 396. — 10 M. de Wulf, 0/>. *at.,* 11, p. 264.

(d. 1523) and later Justus Lipsius (d. 1606). Melanchton himself (d. 1560) adapted a similar spiritism to Luther's teachings and thus attenuated them in more way than one

The complex nature of the Renaissance explains why its representatives have been alternately favoured and obsecrated by the Church. Many bishops and particularly the popes in the XVth century and at the beginning of the XVIth, gave them generous protection, more intent on what was good in humanism than on the danger of an infiltration of a Pagan outlook. The *Catholic reaction* against these abuses[2], from being individual and isolated in the XVIth century became general in the XVIth at the same period as the Church began to defend itself against Protestantism. The *Protestant Reformation* itself was a form of reaction against humanism, notwithstanding certain unnatural alliances that were entered into during the heat of the battle. Nevertheless, this opposition from two sides has not prevented the philosophical humanism of the Renaissance from surviving in one or other of the two great and so-called modern philosophical movements : the *materialist* movement represented by BACON [3], and the spiritist movement embodied in DESCARTES [4] (d. 1650) whose teaching, despite its errors and deficencies [5], was not without value at a time when many minds were unable to adapt themselves to firmer principles.

II. THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.

To confuse the Renaissance with the Protestant Reformation would be a stupid mistake. These two movements may have met on certain points: but the features which essentially characterise them are in radical opposition. The Reformation was a reaction against the optimism with which the Renaissance glorified nature and the natural powers of man, at the same time as it was a reaction against the very real abuses that had found their way into the Church. It doubtless claimed to have returned to the past, but to a past that was Christian, and to the Bible, not to Paganism and the classical literature. The reformers made

1 See below, p. 722.
3 See below, p. 723-726.
3 See above, p. 715.
4 See A. Chollet, *Descartes* in *Diet, thioi.,* col. 532-565.
5 Which amply justify the severity that has been visited on his works.

a wide use of the humanists' criticisms of scholasticism and of contemporary and medieval Christian society, but with a *very* different purpose. Luther did not undertake a human but a religious task; a work which concerned nature, but whose goal was the establishment of a more perfect form of that supernatural divine institution which is Christianity, Luther did not set himself up as a philosopher, but as a religious reformer, a prophet and an apostle, and it as such that history must judge him.

Luther's real forerunners were not, therefore, the humanists, from whom he borrowed merely the negative elements of their teaching; rather were they all those, who, from the end of the Middle Ages had exalted the supernatural to the point of sacrificing human nature. *Ockham*[1] had raised faith to such a height that reason became not only powerless to demonstrate it, but even to establish its natural grounds. Yet, as a determined voluntarist, the Franciscan master, like many other medieval Augustinians[2] had exalted the power of the will to the point of Semipelagianism[3]. In this, however, he was not followed by other Oxford professors: *Thomas Bradwardine* and after him, *Wyclif*[4] starting from diverse premises went to the other extreme, minimised the will, even destroyed freewill, influenced as they were by their ideas of divine causality and predestination. On the other hand, *false spirituals*[5]* were so wrapped up in their personal religious experiences that they threw off the guidance and authority of the Church. All the new doctrinaires imitated them and rejected the Church with its sacraments and hierarchy in the name of individual inspiration. After Wyclif, *John Huss*[6] was chiefly responsible for the spread of these notions in Central Europe. He was Luther's immediate forerunner from a religious standpoint, though from a national viewpoint his influence and doctrine were exploited in a way diametrically opposed to that Germanism which is supposed to have been personified by Luther in the XVIth century.

In all his reforming, Luther invokes St. Augustine's authority. The character of his Augustinism, however, should be well understood. And first, it should be noted that there is nowhere in question those essential points that the great disciples of St. Augustine have always stressed: exemplarism, divine Truth and Goodness, moralism combined with mysticism, etc[7]. He was concerned almost solely[8] with grace and kindred questions, isolated from the doctrine as a whole. Such a method is not wholly to be condemned, provided it remains objective. But we know only too well that Luther on the contrary followed *a wholly subjective path** in his elaboration of his fundamental doctrine of justification by faith without works, right from the first years of his

[1] See above, p. 648. — [2] See above, p. 665.
[3] See above, p. 667. — [4] See p. 666.
[5] See p. 668. — [6] See p. 691.
[7] See above p. 356.
[8] All Protestant theologians and historians concede that Luther's experiences form the basis of his theories. Cf. J. Paquier, *op. cit.*, col. 1295.

religious life[1]. As the stepping-off point of Luther's synthesis we must of course mention the intellectual causes, errors touching the opposition of the flesh and the spirit, based on badly understood texts from St. Paul[3], and the sinful nature of concupiscence, according to a certain Augustinian tradition[3] which he exaggerated : in this respect a journey he made to Rome in 1510 had a most unhappy consequence[4]. He was mainly influenced, however, by moral causes. On his return from Rome he viciously attacked those who observed the rule and scoffed at the works on which these "seekers after justice" claimed to base their holiness[5]. He himself began to abandon his life of piety and jave way repeatedly to carnal temptations, coming to the point when te declared concupiscence to be irresistible[6]. In 1515, at a time when his theory on this point was already complete[7] it would not seem that he was corrupted to the extent of never resisting, but his theory appears in part to be " a fear and a desire : fear of being unable to resist ; desire to be delivered of all hindrance, to live like a monk at the Abbey of Thélème, a desire to which he paid too much heed, which he fostered sedulously and which he had already put partially into practice"[8]. This tendency soon became a full spate and Luther, forgetting his priesthood, contracted a sacreligious marriage with a nun who had abandoned her convent. His was an evolution radically opposed to that of St. Augustine, who, starting from the slavery of the flesh, freed himself after an heroic combat and after his conversion lived the life of an angel in the body of a man. This contrast should enable all serious thinkers to judge of the doctrinal authority of this self-styled disciple of Augustine[9] and of this reformer[10]. Nor were his other theories compatible with Augustine's teaching.

1 Luther (1483-1546) became an Augustinian at Erfurt in Saxony at the age 0(22(1505) after having studied philosophy and law : his vocation had been the fruit of but little reflection, a dangerous thing in one of so violent a temperament and so easily attracted to extremes. Having been ordained priest after his noviciate, he studied theology from 1506 to 1508 and was set to teaching in 1508 at the University of Wittenberg, a new foundation without traditions. Nor did he find any stable doctrinal tradition within his Order : he was thus left almost to his own resources. He kept his chair at Wittenberg until his death (1546). — 2 7v¿>w., Vili, 7; *Gal.,* v, 19-22. Cf. ***IJoan.*** Il, 16.

3 See J. Paquier, *op. cit.,* col. 1190-1206 and 1209-1212. There is here, particularly, a question of very different traditional interpretations. It would seem that Luther did not read St Augustine's actual texts on grace until after 1515. Cf. *ibid.,* col. 1254.

4 For this journey see *ibid.,* col. 1204-1206. Luther then came into contact with the contemporary Italian Augustinian school : see below, p. 729.

5 *Grisar* insists especially on this point which is overlooked by *Denifle.* Cf. J. Paquier, *op. cit.,* col. 1152.

6 This historical point has been firmly established by Denifle.

7 Invincibleness of the passions (anger, pride, lust) and justification by faith alone. J. Paquier, *ibid.,* col. 1218 and 1254. Cf. All the commentaries on the *Epistle to the Romans.* — 8 *Ibid.,* col. 1218.

9 Such diversity of conduct can only proceed from a very contrary understanding of the texts.

10 We pass over other points on which he may be judged, especially the filthy and unspeakable language of his *Table Talk* and other writings, enough to discredit the reformer, whatever racial and literary qualities may be put to his credit in other writings. Our interest here lies only in his religious work.

The kernel of Luther's theology is justification by faith. Man, wholly corrupted by original sin and deprived of freedom[1], can do nothing good. Moral conduct (on which subject Luther adopted very diverse and even contrary positions)[2] is much less important than faith; the latter alone has the power to justify. It is far from easy to define this justifying faith around which Luther accumulated so many contradictory statements. First, he includes the traditional element; the adhesion of the mind to the teaching of Christ; but at this juncture he adds another and for him, more important element : Lutheran faith " is primarily a firm confidence in God, a firm trust that if we go to Him, He will be favourable to us in this and the next world. Justifying faith is thus also hope" [3]. Faith is also variously "fear, humility, desperate abandon of self in the arms of God, the conviction that one is covered with sin, that all one does is sin"; by all this "we justify God and as a consequence obtain that He justifies us. We justify God because we confess ourselves to be sinners : we pay homage to His truth, justice and goodness. And, in return, this faith is our justification " [4]. It must go as far as the certainty of salvation [5] and absolute confidence in individual predestination independently of man's collaboration with the grace of God[6]. Justifying faith is not, strictly speaking, charity, and Luther's command : *Crede et fac quod vis* is not to be confused with St. Augustine's *Avia et fac quod vis.* In any case, Luther avows that his theory of pure faith did not derive from St. Augustine, who, he says " had no precise idea of justification " [7].

This doctrine of Luther blossomed out into a new pseudo-mysticism. Faith and certainty may certainly be partly based on auto-suggestion;

1 This is his theory of the *servum arbitrium* which brought him to grips with Erasmus. Cf. J. Paquier, *op. cit.,* col. 1283-1295.

Sometimes he states that good works are a condition of faith, elsewhere an infallible consequence of faith : more often he declares that no act *in se* is either good or bad, and finally cried out his famous *pecca fortiter sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo* (1st August 1521) whose obvious meaning is clear, no matter the attenuations that have been suggested by Luther's apologists. Cf. J. Paquier, *op. cit.,* col. 1243-1251. — 3 4. Paquier, *ibid.,* col. 1231.

4 L. Cristiani, quoted *ibid.,* 1231-1232. — 5 *Ibid.,* col. 1232-1237.

6 What, says the Protestant Seeberg, distinguishes Lutheran faith from Catholic faith, is that Catholics " speak of man's collaboration in the work of God. They base their confidence on the grace of God and on the merits of the justified man ; Luther bases it only on the grace of God ". *Ibid.,*

1 *Table Talk,* n. 1572 (of 1532).

yet that cannot provide a sufficient foundation and Luther rises to Cod by means of a kind of individual illumination. By revelation he claimed to have discovered* the true meaning of St. Paul's verse 24 on justifying faith, the doctrine that forms his "message", his "gospel". Moreover, all Luther's great theories were the result of such inspirations and he invited his followers to make their own appeal to God's witness. "The Christian must provoke in himself the witness of the Spirit: he must labour to produce and augment within himself the certainty of his present grace and his future salvation" 3. For the acquisition of this religious feeling he had recourse to early mystics, especially Tauler, whom he thus unjustly discredited, and a xivth century (?) treatise which he published in 1516-1518 under the title *Germanic Theology**. He unscrupulously perverted their teaching, the better to bolster up his own doctrine5 and deliberately overlooked the asceticism the mystics took for granted, seeing only a quietisi yielding to God's will and the ecstasy of supernatural religious feeling as described by these authors. Lutheran mysticism which by means of the theory of *private judgment* exalts individualism, leads straight to heresy and rebellion against the Church. Luther was the first to provide the proof as soon as his opinions on indulgences were strenuously-opposed by ecclesiastical authority.

The Lutheran heresy thus covers a wide field. Its main errors from a dogmatic viewpoint are as follows.—I. *Original sin6* has corrupted human nature to the extent of rendering it incapable of all good and depriving it of free will.—2. *Grace,* in practice, is replaced by faith 7. *Actual* grace, perhaps, is not wholly written off, since Luther speaks of a continual action of the Holy Ghost in our "soul", but he sees in it only an immediate operation of God. "The created aspect of grace always seems to have been repugnant to him. This created movement was something too human, too frigid; it took away the immediate contact with God"8. With even greater decision he rejects created *habitual* grace; fallen man is not intrinsically transformed by an infused *habitus* which makes him holy in the sight of God; but the merits of Christ are imputed to him, provided he believes, and this extrinsic grace is enough to form a direct union with God.—3. The *sacraments,* in consequence, are meaningless. In 1520 Luther preached against the Mass and retained only baptism, penance, and the Lord's

* In somewhat unsavoury conditions. Cf. J. Paquier, *op. at.,* col. 1206-1209 *(Incident of the 'Tower).*

2Justitia enim Dei in eo revelatur ex fide in fidem; sicut scriptum est: Justus autem ex fide vivit. *Tom.,* i, 17. —3 J. Paquier, *op. cit.,* col. 1259-1261,

4 See *J.* Paquier, *op. cit.,* col. 1259-1261. —*3 Ibid.,* col. 1261-1274.

6 See above, p. 719. — 7 J. Paquier, *of. cit.,* col. 1237-1240.

B *Ibid.,* col. 1248.

Supper among the sacramental rites. Penance was reduced to no more than a simple declaration of the remission of sins. All these rites are kept in the "Babylonian captivity"[1] i. e., the Church.—Luther's individualism naturally led him to reject the authority *of the Church,* its doctrinal authority (replaced by the "interior voice" and private interpretation of the Scriptures)[2], the priesthood and sacrifice, traditional hierarchical organisation, especially the papacy[3]. The visible Church is the Church of the devil; Christ's Church is interior. Yet by a logical consequence and force of circumstance, Luther came to submit this spiritual society to the temporal prince who thus becomes an "absolute patriarch". This evolution which gave to Lutheranism its final form took place between 1525 and 1530: Protestantism was truly founded[4].

The success of Protestantism was due to manifold causes. The patronage of the civil power to which Luther finally entrusted his Church was not one of the least. Especially noteworthy among the internal principles which made it popular were the easy excitation of religious emotions and its accommodating morality, that pandered to the passions. To these advantages was added the pharisaical satisfaction of a revolt against the real or imaginary abuses of the old Church. Nor should we overlook the personal influence of those who carried on and completed in various ways the works of the Saxon reformer, and who were careful to throw overboard some of those contradictions that seemed so natural to Luther's unbalanced mind.

Melanchthon[5] *Philip Schiuarzerd* (1497-1560), Reuchlin's grand-nephew, was a professor at Wittenberg from 1518. fie began by teaching Greek, but in 1519 became a member of the Faculty of Theology at Luther's instance. In 1521 he published a manual of theology which achieved great popularity. He placed his really great talents as a humanist at the service of Lutheranism; he composed the Augsburg *Confession* in 1530 and the *Apology for the Augsburg Confessions* 1531. He differed from Luther on several points as may be seen in the modifications he made, changes that often hide a real duplicity: for Melanchthon, faith is the fulfilment of reason; freedom remains to

[1] Such is the title of the pamphlet (Oct. 1520) in which Luther expresses his opinions of the sacraments. Cf. *Ibid.,* col. 1297-1298. — [2] *Ibid.,* col. 1299-1304.

[3] The papacy is Babylon; the pope is the devil or antichrist. *Odium papa* is one of Luther's characteristic traits.

[4] See L. Cristiani, *Du luthéranisme au protestantisme.* Paris, 1921, Cf. J. Paqvier, *op. cit.,* col. 1316 sq.

[5] J. Paquier, *Melanchton,* in *Did. theol.,* col. 502-513.

man who must collaborate with God in the work of salvation *(syn-energism).* Melanchthon's mild and timorous nature concealed a hostility to Catholicism that equalled Luther's, and he was far more dangerous than the reformer himself.

Zwingli[*] (1484-1531) principal secular preacher at Zurich from the year 1518, joined in Luther's revolt in 1522 and was followed by German Switzerland. Although at the outset he nourished different ideas from those of Luther, in their more extreme theses they were on common ground. He envisaged however a church supported by the state, for Luther's Christianity "was inconsistent and lacking all noper framework" [2]. Zwingli has been represented as an ardent lumanist, deeply interested in Neoplatonism and Stoicism. In any case his Swiss nationalist aspirations were far more evident.

Calvin[3] (1509-1564) systematised with pitiless severity the principles that had been exuberantly stated by Luther. He codified an inhuman Christianity, based on the ruins of freewill destroyed by original sin and on an absolute predestinationism which looks upon God as a gloomy tyrant[4]. Far from subjecting the Church to the State, he established a severe and hateful theocracy and imposed his teaching by violence, what time he wrote his *Christian Institution* in order to propagate it, and founded the University of Geneva which was to be the focus of Calvinism. He mainly exploited " the all-powerful prestige of *the word of God* contained in the Scriptures... In this respect no one has ever surpassed him in the role of *prophet,* infallible interpreter of the mind and will of God. He reigned by means of religious terror"[5]. Scottish Presbyterians, English Puritans, Dutch Calvinists and French Huguenots were his most loyal disciples[6].

III. THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION.

Long before Luther and the self-styled reformers of the XVIth century the question of reform had been agitated within the Church from the end of the Middle Ages[7]. During these troubled times various abuses had crept into the many units of the Christian social organisation and virtuous men had endeavoured to find a remedy [8]. Their efforts, however,

[*] Cfr. Journet, *Réforme (en Suisse),* in *Did. Ap.,* col. 733-742.

[2] *Ibid.,* col. 736.

[3] A. Baudrillart, *Calvin, Calvinisme,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 1372-1422; L. Cristiani, *Réforme (Calvin...)* in *Did. Ap.,* col. 622-647.

[4] Modern Calvinists reject the reformer's idea of God, forgetting perhaps that this pessimistic concept is the keystone of the whole system.

[5] L. Cristiani, *ibid.,* col. 645.

[6] Since its beginnings, however, Protestantism has undergone far-reaching transformations (termed *evolutions)* under the influence of what is perhaps its sole essential clement; aversion to the authority of Rome.

[7] Among the more illustrious of these men were the Franciscans St. John Capistrano (d. 1456) St. Bernardino of Siena (d. 1444), the Dominicans, St. Antony of Florence (d. 1459) John Dominici (d. 1419). Jerome Savonarola (1452-149S) embodied the violent and extreme reaction against the Pagan spirit.

weic but partially rewarded and it is more usual to stress the innovations of some forerunners of Protestantism or the initiative of the humanists, whose works at that time exercised enormous fascination.

Many Christian humanists did indeed nurse a burning desire to reform the Church and several of them composed works that achieved some effect.

Erasmus (1464-1536), to mention only one, and the greatest of them all [1], endeavoured especially to nullify the Pagan corruption of the Renaissance by means of his *Enchiridion militis christiani* and his *De contembtu mundi**. In the former writing he teaches the Christian to fight lhe devil, the world, and the flesh with the weapons of prayer, knowledge of the Scriptures, and the imitation of Christ. In the latter he sings the praises *of* solitude and complete abnegation. Very similar was a little opusculum on preparation for death[4]. While he shews the Christian the remedies against evil, he also counsels the development of the interior life, aided by pious practices, without, however, any suffocating formalism. Above all, he advises the reading of the Bible, for the understanding of which the definitions of the Church must of course be followed, but also the inspirations of the Holy Ghost: the Christian in thus God-taught : Οεοδίδακτο In its moral teaching, humanism remained consistent. "Erasmus looked upon the austerities of the saints as something to be condemned. They did not fit in with his ideal of the sincere Christian, who, of course, mortifies his passions, prays, lends himself to exterior practices, but never goes beyond the limits of elegant moderation. Such was not the outlook of saints who have been the reformers of their times. Dilettantes[6] will never be real men of action... Neither Erasmus nor Lefèvre were of the stuff that true reformers are made" [7].

Christian humanism carried out its reaction against the Pagan spirit, and developed its moralising influence, under the most varied guises. One of the pioneers of the Renaissance in Germany in the xvth century was Nicholas of Cusa [8] (d. 1464), made cardinal in 1448. With a love of humanism he combined mystical interests, and had free recourse for his theories to Neoplatonism, just as his illustrious colleague

1 See above, p. 716. — 2 See above, p. 718.

3 See P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrét.,* in, p. 76-95.

4 The *De preparations ad mortem,* says M. Pourrai (p. 82) had a success that may be likened to that of the Imitation.

5 "Here we come upon the very essential of the mysticism of the Christian humanists. The faithful man, who reads the Bible, receives, the better to understand it, a kind of individual inspiration". *Ibid.,* p. 87.

6 "Erasmus though he taught piety in his books, hardly practised it himself. He "rarely if ever said Holy Mass... although he was a priest"; he was even reproached with hearing it but seldom". P. Pourrat, *ibid.,* p. 93. Erasmus, educated at Deventer (see p. 702) became a Canon of St. Augustine in i486, but after 1491 he lived outside lhe Order. He was ordained in 1492.

7 P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 93. See below, p. 725.

8 See especially E. Van Sternberghe, *Le card. Nicolas de C., Daction, la pensée,* Paris, 1920.

Cardinal Bessarion introduced admiration for Plato in Rome[1]. The influence of Nicholas of Cusa was wielded in France and Italy, but his school had no lasting authority[2]. The French humanist, who published his works, Lefèvre d'Etaples (1456-1537) was more pious than Erasmus, but he gave greater insistence to the need of seeking rules of Christian life in the direct communications of the soul with God. As he seemed to minimise the hierarchy and its doctrinal importance, he was at times suspected of opening the way to Lutheranism[3]; yet he rejected this heresy as did his disciple JOSSE CLICHTOVE (d. 1543) at Paris in 1524[4], and in England in 1523 the Chancellor St. Thomas More (d. 1535)[5]. Christian humanism as represented by these authors and also Erasmus had nothing in common with the Protestant Reformation[6].

This movement became swifter and surer at the end of the XVIth century and with certain authors took on a very marked piety. Hence the appellation devout humanism given to it by M. Bremond[7]. Its soundest and most charming representative is St. Francis of Sales[8].* From a doctrinal viewpoint he carefully avoided all the defects of humanism and particularly criticism of the Middle Ages and the outward forms of piety, which, together with those who practised them, had been so discredited by certain writers. Devout humanism, as we see it, is "above all a school of personal holiness; a doctrine, a theology, if you will, but a theology wholly affective and practical"; it "applies the principles and the spirit of Christian humanism to the needs of the interior life and brings them within reach of all"'. This piety in its own way was a reaction against the Protestant form of Christianity.

The great movement of Catholic reform took its impetus mainly from the authority[7] of the Church and in particular the Council of Trent (1545-1563). The work of the latter was of immense importance. *From the dogmatic viewpoint*[10] it defined with admirable exactitude all the main points

1 See above, p. 689.

3 "Moreover, on every side mysticism flickered out at the breath of the Renaissance", says M. DE Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 235.

3 See Amann, *Lefèvre d'Etaples,* in *Diet, théol.*, col. 132-159.

4 In his *Antilutherus.*

5 In his *Vindicatio Henrici Vili a calumniis Lutheri.*

6 The work of the priest Pierre Charron comes under the head of this Christian, moralising humanism. Having refuted Protestantism in his *Trois Vérités,* he attempted in his *Sagesse* to complete Montaigne's ideas of morality, by shewing that natural morality is the basis of one that is nobler i.e., Christian wisdom. Guillaume du Vair (1156-1621) develops a similar theme, but with greater depth and lightness of touch, in his *Sainte Philosophie.*

7 *Hist, du sentiment relig.,* 1, p. I-17.

8 The other authors mentioned by Bremond are the Jesuits, Louis Richeomc and Etienne Binet, and the Salesian, J. P. Camus, and the Franciscan, Yves de Paris. *Ibid.,* vol. 1, *passim.* — » *Ibid.,* p. 17.

,0Denzinger B., *Ench. Symb.,* n. 782-1000, p. 260-329(12111 ed.). As is well known only eleven or twelve of the 25 sessions had successful and effective results.

of the Catholic faith that had been denied or disfigured by the Protestants. Its first decrees, regarding the sources of the faith (session IV), original sin (s. V), justification (s. Vi) are especially important and detailed ; that of session VI is a theological masterpiece x. The decrees regarding the sacraments (sess. VII, XIII, XIV, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV)2 as well as the veneration of saints and indulgences (s. XXV)3 had a narrower application and set up a coherent and complete body of doctrine in the face of Protestantism. A more delicate business carried through by the Council was the measures for reform as embodied in its *disciplinary decrees*\ The majority were general decrees concerning the teaching of true doctrine (sess. v), the obligations and rights of bishops (sess vi, VII, XIII, xiv, xxi) and the lesser clergy (s. XXII). Several points treated in these sessions were resumed and studied in greater detail in later sessions (XXIII, XXIV, XXV) together with a number of desiderata regarding the Roman Curia. Special decrees dealt with the laity, the married state and the religious state. The business acomplished was of vast extent and the popes who carried it through to a successful outcome in face of political and other forms of opposition deserved well of the Church. With them should be associated the last popes of the XVIth century who set the decrees in motion, and especially Pius V. This latter published the *Catechism of the Council of Trento* (1566) which summarised for the convenience of the clergy the whole of traditional theology and the Council's decrees.

The work of the Council had been prepared by theologians; after its closure, their desire was to see that it bore

1 *Ibid.,* n. 793-843 (16 chaps., followed by 33 canons). See J. Rivière, *Justification*, in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2164-2192.

3 See *ibid.,* η. 844-982. — 3 4 *Ibid.,* 983-989.

4 See the collections of the councils. Denzinger gives a number of extracts having a dogmatic bearing, n. 990-1000.

5 Drawn up, at the instance of lhe Council, by a commission presided by St. Charles Borromeo (1538-1584) which continued its labours after the Council, the Roman Catechism appeared in 1566 with the sanction of St. Pius V under the title : *Caicchisinus ex decreto concilii Tridentini adparochos, Pii Pjussu editus.* " This catechism is not a book of creeds or a confession of faith made obligatory for all Christians; it is a book of doctrine, not a summary meant for the laity, nor a manual for lhe teaching of theology, but an explanation of dogma, capable of completing the theological learning of priests and aiding them in their preaching and catechetical instructions. It is divided into four parts, which summarise Catholic doctrine and treat successively of the *Creed,* the *Sacraments,* the *Ten Commandements* and *Prayer".* E. Mangenot, *Catéchisme,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1918.

fruit. And indeed, the XVIth century saw a true revival of all branches of theology [1]. *Scholastic* theology which had been the object of so much scorn, was widely cultivated, with methods greatly perfected by Franciscans and Dominicans and also by the Jesuits who opened up new paths. Reacting against Protestantism the controversialists dwelt on the *positive* bases of faith, Scripture and Tradition [2]: hence the importance that then clothed certain treatises, such as the *Loci theologici* and the *De Ecclesia,* or certain methods, such as positive theology, which, in the following century was destined to develop magnificently. Finally, *moral theology* came to be studied with a precision and practical outlook unheard of till then, thanks to the pressure of those who zealously fostered the fréquentation of the sacraments.

Catholic spirituality in the XVIth century was also marvellously renewed [3] and in this respect the reaction against false Protestant mysticism was particularly successful. Whilst St. Ignatius represented the ascetismi that had been too much neglected by the pseudo-reformers, other authors, whose work was to become classical, raised mystical theology to its zenith: Saint Teresa, St. John of the Cross and St. Francis of Sales, clarified in their own particular way this extremely delicate and complex branch of theology. They thus ruled out the rash theories of many eccentric spirituals who were condemned by the Church, such as the *Alumbrados* in Spain; they completed the work of early writers, rendering it more exact, and laid the foundations of a definite systematisation.

[1] The five following chapter which are devoted to theology, p. 728-790, are meant to describe this revival, stressing in particular the work of a few men.

[3] As mav be seen in the last chapters of this work, p. 79θ-^όo.

CHAPTER IL

The Theological Revival in the XVIth century.

Special Bibliography : see the notes for each author.

I. THEOLOGIANS of the early schools.

The XVIth century saw that revival of theology which counts as one of the glories of the Renaissance. This theology, regarded in its entirety, owes but little to the XVth century which, despite some attempts at reaction, was under the spell of contemporary movements and prolonged the decadence that had begun in the Xivth.

I. The predominance of Occamism in the Universities was an obvious token of this l. In Paris the Faculty of Arts was the focus of the nominalist movement. In 1474 the Faculty of Theology obtained a decree of proscription against it from Louis XI, but this was withdrawn in 1481. Towards the end of the century Nominalism found its way to Spain, and at Salamanca, for instance, Ockham's doctrines were taught side by side with those of Scotus and St Thomas.

The most renowed representative of Occamism in the XVth century was Gabriel Biel2 (1425-1495) curate of Mainz, a famous preacherand later a professor at Tubingen whose chief glory he was at that period. His chief work is a *Collectorium* or collection of lectures on the 4 Books of Sentences. He was more moderate than other advocates of the theory and prudently avoided their errors : determinism, scepticism, pantheism, as well as attacks on the Pope, whom on the contrary he defended. " Had it been possible for Nominalism to be a Catholic system, we should have had Biel to thank for it ", concludes Mgr Ruch3. Luther, who was acquainted with our Tubingen theologian was nevertheless pleased to cull some of his ideas. In the following century the most outstanding master of the school was the Scot, John Mayor4 (1478-1540), a Parisian Doctor whom Rabelais singled out as embodying the Scholasticism he loved to ridicule. About this time humanism and the Reformation sounded the death knell of Nominalism.

1 M. de Wulf, *Hist. phil. mid.,* 11, p. 268-271.
3 Ch. Ruch, *Biel (Gabriel),* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 814-825.
3 *Ibid.,* col. Si7. See col. 817-824 for a summary of Biel's theology.
4 Also called *John Scot Mayor;* not to be confused of course with Duns Scotus.

2. At the other extreme is found the Platonism of Cardinal NICHOLAS OF CUSA 1 (1401-1464) who was not only a man of action but also a scholar and a thinker. This latter characteristic forms our interest here.

Aghast at the excesses of the Nominalist school, Nicholas attempted to save metaphysics by means of mysticism, and build up a new synthesis which would reconcile faith and reason. He borrowed his data from all the contemporary systems, but Neoplatonic ideas were predominant and characteristic. In his general theory of the return of all beings to God, their source, his theory of understanding should be noted. In his opinion, truth cannot be attained by means of the rational operation of the mind, but only through *intuition,* by the intelligence; by confessing his ignorance, man arrives at true knowledge *(De docta ignorantia).* Whatever may be its shortcomings, this work avoids Pantheism and scepticism, both as regards the writer's intention and the matter of the text. In any case the work is noteworthy as an attempt at reaction against the abuses of decadent scholasticism. It foreshadowed other personal writings. Among those who drew their inspiration from Plato, in addition to Nicholas of Cusa and Bessarion, may be mentioned the Augustinian, Giles of Viterbo, of whom we shall write below.

The Augustinian regulars who, since the time of Giles of Rome, had been Thomist, soon fell under the spell of Nominalism2 3 Furthermore, their veneration for St. Augustine led them to revive certain ideas of the great doctor that theologians had tended to leave aside. Consequently they particularly stressed the operation of God in the soul, and disregarded the co-operation of the latter 3.

These tendencies were already noticeable in the XVth century in the work of Favaroni4 (d. 1453 or 1445) a future general of the Order. He made a number of statements that seem similar to Luther's, though they do not possess the same implicit meaning as the reformer's5. It is possible that the latter was directly influenced by the general of the Order, Giles of Viterbo6 1507-1518 (d. 1532) at the time of his Roman visit. Giles made no attempt to conceal his aversion for Aristotelian scholasticism and his love of the Platonism revealed to him by Marsilio Ficino7 8 Even Luther's excesses did not cause the scandalised theologians of the Order to modify their tendencies : Seripando s

1 The soundest work on this author is E. Van Steenberghe's study mentioned above (p. 724). — 2 See above, p. 674.

3 J. Paquier, *Luther,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 1202-1203. — 4 *ibid.,* col. 119S.

5 " Here below, man is incapable of acquiring *perfect justice.* The law is not for the good but for the bad. Our justice does not consist in a *habitus* infused in us; but God is *our formal justice.* Lastly, God predestinates to hell as well as to heaven ". *Ibid.* — 6 *Ibid.,* col. 1204-1205. — 7 See above, p. 715.

8 *Ibid.,* col. 1199-1202. Cf. J. Rivière, *Tustification* in *Did. théol.,* col. 2166 sq.

(I493-I563λ general from 1539 to 1551 and as such a member of the Council of Trent, set out the severe conception of justification that was then current in the Augustinian Order. Yet, in spite of appearances, it differs fundamentally from Lutheranism since " Seripando always maintained man's responsibility towards God and the obligation of keeping His moral law " '. His presentation of his ideas was probably modified, but it was never condemned. Named cardinal in 1561, he was one of the legates sent to the Council by Pius IV.

brom the end of the Middle Ages the favourite master of the Franciscan School 1 was Duns Scotus ; since the XVith century, however, some branches of the Order have followed St. Bonaventure.

Commentaries of Duns Scotus's works are found after the middle of the XVth century3; they became more numerous in the following century. The best known are by :

Petrus Tartaretus (d. 1494)4, Parisian doctor, on Duns Scotus's *Quodlibet* and *Oxoniense;*

Francesco Lichetto5 (d. 1520) general of the Observants, on the *Oxoniense.*

Mauritius de Portu (d. 1513) (O'Fihely)6, a master at Oxford and Padua before becoming a bishop in Ireland, on the philosophical works and his doctrine as a whole. Those who remained loyal to the Subtle Doctor were mainly Observants and Conventuals7. Countless were the doctors who went to him for their inspiration and the movement became even more ample in the XViith century after Wadding had founded, at Rome, the famous college of Saint Isidore (1625) which was to become an enthusiastic centre of Scotism8.

The most zealous propagator of the study of St. Bonaventure was Sixtus V9, who founded in Rome, at the Twelve Apostles, a college bearing his name and under his patronage, and who, in the following year, inscribed the saint among the Doctors of the Church. The pope was particularly desirous that he should be studied by the Conventuals. Yet the Capuchins were the first to proclaim St. Bonaventure the leader of their newly formed school. " At the beginning of their reform they had forbidden the setting up of studies in their congregation; teaching was given in private. After the Council of Trent, the general Chapter of 1562 ordered study houses to be opened in all the provinces, such as already existed in several. To this end they hastened to have printed an edition of the Seraphic Doctor's commentaries on the Sentences *°... It 1593 there died at Naples the Capuchin, Peter Trigos, of Calatayud, who taught St. Thomas's doctrine while he was with the Jesuits, but who followed St. Bonaventure when instructing his own

1 J. Paquier, *ibid.*, col. 1201.

3 E. d'Alençon, *Frères Mineurs* in *Did. thiol.t* col. 835-840. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* vol. Il and III *(passim).*

3 Cf. M. de Wulf, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 196. —4 Hurter, *op. cit.,* 11, col. 995-996.

s *Ibid.,* col. 1105. —6 *Ibid.,* col. 1104. —7 Cf. E. d'Alençon, *op. cit.*

F Hurter, *ibid.,* in, col. 962. — 9 E. d'Alençon, *op. cit.,* col. 836.

10 It appeared in 1569 under the patronage of St. Pius V. Others soon followed.

brethren. He composed a *Summa theologica,* drawn from the commentaries on the Sentences " *, " *insigne opus* " 9 of which, unfortunately, there remains but one book 3. Whether they followed St. Bonaventure or Scotus, the Franciscans defended the traditional faith against the Protestants and distinguished themselves in controversy.

Owing to the importance that is now given to St. Thomas in the teaching of theology we must give more space in the following chapters to the Dominican School, particularly as it is needful to define its position in contrast with the new theological school that came into being with the Jesuits in the XVIth century and which also claims St. Thomas as its master. One development however must be mentioned here, for it was destined to have a lasting effect on theological teaching in every domain : the substitution of the *Summa theologica* for the Books of. Sentences as the text to be explained at lectures. According to Mandonnet, this change took place gradually and is due to the Order of Preachers 4. It is mentioned at the end of the XVth century and by the middle of the XVIth was firmly established in all the Dominican schools and in many of the universities. A result of this was the appearance of the commentaries, in the true sense of the term. Before coming to a study of the latter, we must mention the principal controversial works that were provoked by Protestantism in all Catholic circles.

II. THE CONTROVERSIALISTS.

In the majority of the countries of Western Europe, the Protestant Reformation aroused a lively opposition. Both seculars and regulars made it a point of honour to refute the reformers, each according to their own methods and the means at their disposition. The controversial works were therefore of many kinds. Some took the form of a direct refutation of the reformers' theories, while others represented an indirect reaction by means of simple explanations of the faith, or a detailed research into its traditional and historical foundations which were rejected by the Protestants. In these pages it is evidently impossible to cover all the ground or to mention all the authors who

' E. d'Alençon, *ibid.* — * According to the Quarrachi editors.

3 Before Trigos, E. Brulefer (d. about 1496) a Conventual, wrote *reportata* (Bale, 1501-1507) on St. Bonaventure's commentaries on the Sentences.

4 Art. *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Did. thèol..,* col. 906-90S

wrote on these subjects during the XVIth century. We shall endeavour to point out the most outstanding representatives of Catholic theology in each country and illustrate their methods. To this we shall add a few observations on positive theology, which, like controversy, may be regarded as an introduction to speculation and which counted as one of the favourite weapons of the defenders of the faith.

A). In Germany.

1. **Jacob van Hoogstraten**[1] (Hochstraten) (d. 1527) a Dominican, born in Brabant, later prior at Cologne and inquisitor in Germany, was the first to denounce Luther's errors and wrote several vigorous and pointed memoranda and treatises against him. His activity in the Reuchlin case had already brought him to the fore.

2. **John Eck**[2] (1486-1543) professor *of* theology at Ingoldstadt who in 1518 had criticised Luther's celebrated theses in his *Obelisci,* carried on the dispute by means of public lectures and innumerable writings. Until his death he stood as the immovable rock of orthodoxy in Germany.

3. **Cochlaeus or John Dobeneck**[3] (1489-1552) dean of St. Mary of Frankfurt and later canon of Mainz, resisted Melanchthon at Augsburg, refuted the Protestant Confession and wrote continuously until his death against the leading heads of the Reformation. He was an orator, rather than theologian. Eck was better as a controversialist

4. **John Gropper**[4] (1503-1559) chancellor of the diocese of Cologne was extremely active in fostering the Catholic reformation and a very correct and courteous controversialist; he was made a cardinal in 1555, but refused the honour.

5. **Frederick Staphylus**[5] (1512-1564) of Osnabrück, converted to Lutheranism during his long stay of 10 years at Wittenburg, returned to the Church in 1553 and soon acquired great renown on account of his refutations of the errors he knew so well : he was Rector of the Ingoldstadt Academy.

6. **Stanislaus Hosius**] 1504-1579) a Pole, Bishop of Cholm and of Ermland, the pope's legate in Poland and later the king's ambassador to Rome, was one of the most powerful defenders of the faith in Poland and East Prussia not only by means of his pastoral activity but also by his wiitings.

1 Hurter, *Nomenci.,* 11, col. 1263-1265. Cf. R. C0UI.ON, *Hochstraten,* in *Did. thiol.·,* col. 11-17.

Hur ler, *op. at.,* 11, 1396-1401. Cf. A. Humbert, *Eck,* in *Did. thiol..* col. 2056-2057.

3 Hurter, *op. cit.,* 11, 1411-1414. Cf. C. Toussaint, *Cochite,* in *Did. thiol.*, col. 204-205.

Î IITMRTEjk *of›' ciS* Ï4Î9-I423· Cf. A. Humbert, *Gro/per,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 1881-1885. —5 Hurter, *op. cit.,* in, 19-21.

1 Cit 'i IH' 44'47' Cf› A· 1Iumrert, *Hosius,* in *Did. thiol.,*

7. St. Peter Canisius [2](1521-1597) played so brilliant a part in the resistance to Protestantism that he earned the title of *Apostle of Modern Germany* and has since been made a Doctor of the Church.

Born at Nimwegen in the Netherlands, Peter Canisius studied the humanities at Co ogne, as also philosophy and theology before his ordination to the priesthood in 1546. At this time he had been for three years a member of the Society of Jesus (1543) to which he had turned after following the *Exercises* at Mainz under the guidance of Blessed Le Fèvre : with him the Jesuits established a footing in Cologne. After his ordination he went with Cardinal Truchsess (of Augsburg) to Trent where he played but a minor rôle. He stayed for some time at Rome and in Sicily and finally in 1549 St. Ignatius sent him back to Germany. He was to remain there for more than 30 years. He began by working in university towns, Ingoldstadt (1549-1552), Vienna (1552-1556). He was the first German provincial of the Society (1556-1569) which, under his direction, expanded remarkably throughout the country. When he retired from office he withdrew to the College of Dillingen and busied himself with writings against the Magdeburg Centuriators, at the recjuest of Pius V. He spent his last years at Freiburg in Switzerland, occupying himself with the foundation of a new college, preaching and writing.

The culminating point of his life consisted evidently in the thirty years he spent in Germany on his return from Italy in 1519: " Pregnant years, in which Canisius appears successively, or even simultaneously as an educator of youth, preacher and missionary, organiser and mainstay of his Order, counsellor and guide of princes, champion of Catholicism in the Diets of the Empire, papal nuncio and publicist. Yet in this so varied life one idea predominated, giving it soul and unity : the opposition to the so-called Reformation of a movement of true and salutary religious reform, in order to consolidate the Catholic faith in the regions that remained loyal to Rome and make of them a rampart against the wave of Protestantism that threatened to invade the whole of Germany. Consequently' both Catholic and Protestants have often qualified Canisius' work by the name of Counter-Reformation "[a].

'I he influence of Peter Canisius was mainly felt in practical matters : "He was above all and in an outstanding measure a man of action"[3]. Every office that he filled, every institution he founded "tended towards the same end: the growth of an active and militant faith among Catholics, the better to set up an efficacious resistance to Protestantism"[4]. The colleges he founded proved to be his best resource and constituted an impregnable wall against the advance of the Lutheran reformation.

[1] X. Le Bachelet, *Canisius* (Le B. Pierre), in *Did. thiol.*, col. 1507-1537. L. Cristiani, *Le Bx. P. Canisius* (Coll. *Les Saints),* Paris, 1925. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* in, p. 196-199.

[2] Le Bachelet, *op. cit.*, col. 1509.

[3] *Ibid.*, col. 1535.

[4] *Ibid.*

His extensive writings[1] tend to the same practical goal; even in his endeavours *to re-edit early works,* such as those of St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. Leo the Great, he aimed at refuting heresy with unanswerable arguments or to edify the clergy by the example of these great models. The appositeness of his *refutation of the Centuriators of Magdeburg* is self evident, despite the fact that his superiors thought themselves justified in interrupting the work after the second volume[2] and sending the saint to Switzerland, there to practise a more active ministry and devote himself to propaganda. From this period of his life dates the majority of his *devout opuscula* which well characterise his method and interests. His renown as a writer however is mainly due to his Catechisms. Of these there are three, published first in Latin and then in German. "In reality, however, these three books form but one and the same work: they contain one and the same teaching given with a greater or lesser degree of amplification and adapted to the various types of layfolk for whom they were meant. The little catechism, *minimus,* was for children and uninstructed adults[3,4] it was, as it were, a counterpoise to Luther's catechism. The original *Summa** corresponded to the reformer's little catechism; it was meant for the universities and the higher classes in the colleges. The *Catechismus parvus catholicorum*[5] was a *via media* intended for students of the lower classes and young people similarly situated"[6].

The general method used by the author in his catechisms is noteworthy. "On principle he avoids any direct attack; for he was convinced that by limiting himself to a simple explanation of Catholic doctrine he would achieve greater and better results than by the use of discussion and controversy. Consequently what strikes the reader in his little book is not only the clarity of its plan and development, its wealth of doctrine combined with concision of style, its scriptural and patristic allusion; but also that fine serenity of teaching which is all the more remarkable inasmuch as it is in sharp contrast to the bitter polemical tone usual with his Lutheran adversaries"[7]. The work was enormously successful and led to a revival of the Catholic faith in Germany. To this work is mainly due the saint's elevation to the rank Doctor of the Church (May 21st 1925).

1 See the list, *ibid.,* 1523-1534. Edit, of his letters by Braunsberger, Freiburg, 1912 sq., 7 vols. By the same, *S'. Can. Doctor E.,* in *Gregorianum,* 1925.

2 *De verbi Dei corruptelis,* I; *De Maria Virg. incomparabili,* II. Seep. 737.

3 *Summa doctrina Christiana.., ad captum rudiorum accommodata;* 1556 (59 questions).

4 *Summa doctrina Christiana... in usum Christiana pueritia nunc priminn edita,* 1555 (211 questions); this was the first to appear. The *Opus catechisticum* is but a re-edition of the same work, with the text of scriptural and Patristic passages to which references only were given in the former edit. (2nd ed.).

5 Appeared in 1558 (122 questions).

6 X. Le Bachelet, *ibid.,* col. 1525. — 7 *Ibid.,* col. 1526.

B). Outside Germany.

1. In ENGLAND the swords were first crossed with Luther himself and later with the English reformers.

Saint John Fisher[1] (1459-1535) Bishop of Rochester first collaborated with Henry VIII against Luther, and later wrote against other reformers and Henry himself : after imprisonment he was put to death a few days after he had been made cardinal.

St. Thomas More[2] (1478-1535) brilliant humanist, and friend of Erasmus, was a sincerely Christian layman. He first wrote against Luther and later against the English heretics. He was raised to the highest public offices and became Chancellor in 1529. He fell foul of the king in the matter of the divorce and papal supremacy and resigned his post in 1532. He was executed a few days after Fisher.

Reginald Pole[3] (1500-1558) cardinal, came of a noble family. Under Henry VIII, Edward \rI and Mary Stuart he wrote books mainly in defense of the unity of the Church.

We should also mention William Allen[4*] (1532-1594) rector of the famous English College at Douai : Blessed Edmund Campion[5], the Jesuit (1540-1581) martyr ; Thomas Stapleton[6,7] a Doctor of Louvain, professor at Douai. All three wrote controversial works.

2. Netherlands. In addition to Erasmus who defended freewill against Luther[7], the following well known controversialists are found in the Netherlands.

Albert Pighius[8] (d. 1543) a doctor of Louvain and Cologne, combated Protestantism in the course of various official missions and by several writings, especially on grace : he evolved a number of personal theories on original sin, justification and predestination.

Josse Clichtove[9] (1472-1543) a native of Nieuport, a Sorbonne professor and Canon of Chartres, was a convinced humanist, a fertile theologian and after the year 1520, an untiring polemist.

B. Latomus (Masson)[10] (1475-1544) rector of Louvain University, a severe opponent of Protestantism against which most of his writings are aimed.

G. Lindanus (Van der Linden)[11] (1525-1588) Bishop of Ruremonde and Ghent entered the controversy with an erudition and moderation that was rare at that period.

[*] A. Humbert, *Fisher (John),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 2555-2561. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 11, 1269-1270.

[1] P. JANELLE, *More (Le Bx Th.),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 2472-2482. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 11, 1267-1269. —[3] Hurter, *op. cit.,* 11, 1466-1468.

[4] *Ibid.,* in, 172-175. —[5] *Ibid.,* 165-167. —[6] *Ibid.,* 175-178.

[7] In his *De libero arbitrio,* 1524. For Erasmus, see above, p. 715 and p. 724.

[8] Hurter, *op. cit.,* 11, 1142-1444.

[9] *Ibid.,* 1444-1446. Cf. A. Cl er VAL, *Clichtove,* in *Diet, th.,* col. 236-243.

[10] Hurter, *op. cit.,* 1447-1449. E. Amann, *Latomus* in *Diet, th.,* col. 2626-2628.

[11] Hurter, *op. cit.,* in, 1S7-1S9. Cf. E. Amann, *Lindanus* in *Diet, th.,* col. 772-776.

Ruard Tapper[1] (d. 1559) doctor of Louvain, was a theologian at the Council of Trent and wrote various treatisem on the questions raised by the pseudo-reformers.

3. France. In the second half of the XVIth century (in addition to Clichtove who lived mainly in France) are to be found the more outstanding French controversialists.

Claude d'Espence[2] (1511-1573) a Sorbonne Doctor, Rector of the University (1540), counsellor to the king and Chancellor of Lorraine, was an enemy of all excess and especially of heated controversy.

Claude de Sainetes[3][4] (1525-1591) Sorbonne Doctor, Bishop of Evreux, wrote a number of learned refutations of Calvinism, especially as regards the Holy Eucharist.

Du Perron *(Jacques Davy)** (1556-1618) was the most illustrious French controversialist of the period. He came of a Calvinist family and was brought up in the sect. Converted, he became an influential diplomat and statesman, Bishop of Evreux (1591) then Archbishop of Sens (1606) and cardinal (1604). As an orator and one deeply read in Patristic writings, he successfully and brilliantly undertook public disputations with the Protestants. In 1600 he scored over Duplessy-Mornay "the Huguenot Pope". He also wrote extensively on the questions that were then being aired on the Church and the Eucharist. His method consists in basing his theses on numerous Scriptural and Patristic texts. He was able to draw on an immense fund *of* erudition. Should he have been a genius, as Bossuet thought, "in reality,his genius was mediocre : he produced nothing new".

N. Coeffeteau.[5] (1574-1623), Dominican, prior of Saint James, vicar general of the Order in France, Bishop coadjutor of Metz and Bishop of Marseilles is best known for his controversial works on the Eucharist and ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Pierre Charron[6] (1541-1603) wrote a remarkable demonstration of the truth of Catholicism against the Protestants under the title : *Trois Vérités.*

For St. Francis of Sales as controversialist, see p. 842.

4. Spain. Though remote from the centre of the Protestant heresy, Spain, in the XVIth century, produced controversialists worthy of note.

Alphonsus de Castro[7] (1495-1558) a Franciscan of the Observance, theologian at the Council of Trent, wrote a considerable number of treatises against the Protestants.

1 Hurter, *op. cit.,* 11, 1451-1452.

2 *Ibid.,* in, 17-19. Cf. A. Humbert, *Espence,* in *Did. th.,* col. 603-605.

3 *Ibid.,* 181-184.

4 *Ibid.,* 405-411. C. Constantin, *Du Perron,* in *Did. th.,* col. 1953-1960.

5 Hurter, *op. cit.,* nr, 715-718. R. CouLON, *Coeffeteau,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 267-271.

6 1ÉRET, *op. cit.,* m, 384 sq. See above, p. 725.

7 Huret, *op. cit.,* u, 1395-1396. En. d'Alençon, *Cadrò* in *Did. th.,* col. 1835-1836.

Andreas de Vega[1] (d. 1560) one of Castro's brother religious and a colleague at the Council of Trent, made a special study of the doctrine of justification in order to destroy Calvinist teaching.

Diego de Andrada[2] (d. 1578) Portuguese theologian, summoned to Trent, also wrote a volume on all the points denied by the reformers.

Other Spanish theologians, both Dominicans and Jesuits who defended the Catholic faith will be mentioned below.

5. ITALY. The best known Italian controversialist in the XVIth century is CARDINAL Bellarmine[3]. Since his work, however, is mainly of theological interest it will be treated later, together with that of the Jesuit theologians. Baronins may find a place here. He fought the Protestants on the field of Christian history.

Cardinal Baronins (1538-1607) Oratorian, spiritual son and successor of St. Philip Neri planned in his *Annales ecclesiastici*[4] to refute the erroneous or biased assertions of the Centuriators of Magdeburg[5] by means of well documented proofs. The work was continued by various authors[6] and even criticised later by two brothers, the Franciscans Antoine and François Pagi, who pointed out its errors and wrote 4 volumes of corrections. Despite its defects, this monumental work had nevertheless a far-reaching effect, for he was a pioneer in the study of history according to a new method.

Historical theology for which Baronius paved the way, did not attain its zenith until the following century with the Jesuit D. Petau (1583-1632), the Oratorian THOMASSIN 1619-1695) and a number of others[7]. Their *positive theology* is a kind of apologetics and an introduction to speculative theology. Melchior Cano had shewn the way by his *Loci theologici*[8]. It was the Jesuits however in the XVIth century who entered the most wholeheartedly upon it. St. Ignatius

[1] Hurter, *op. cit.*, n, 1390-1392.

[2] *Ibid.*, in, 59-62. C. Toussaint, *Andrada* in *Did. th.*, col. 1179.

[3] Hurter, *op. cit.*, in, 527-539.

[4] His chief work in 12 vols in fol., 15S8-1607; from the beginning to the year II9S.

[5] The Centuriators of Magdeburg were learned Protestants who wrote an Ecclesiastical History divided into periods of 100 years or *centuries: Ecclesiastica historia...,* Bâle, 13 vols in fol., 1559-1574; they deal with the first 13 centuries and are written in a spirit very hostile to Catholicism. The authors purpose was to shew the harmony between Protestant teaching and the faith of the early Church. For St. P. Canisius' refutation see p. 733.

[6] From 1198 to 1585 by j *Oratorians,* Raynaldi, xvnth c., 9 vols, Ledercht, xvinth c., 3 vols, A. Theiner, xixth c., 2 vols; From 119S to 1572 by the Polish Dominican, Bzovius, xvnth c., 9 vols (poor); Prom 119b to 1640 by II. de Sponde, Bishop of Pamiers (xvnth cent.).

[7] See *Introduction,* vol. I, p. 16.

[8] See below, p. 745.

liad urged it upon them [1] and dating from this period we find that their method is "marked by a combination in a greater degree than hitherto of the scholastic element represented by St. Thomas, and the positive element mainly supplied by the Fathers; the two elements are complementary and each reinforces the other, not only in practice owing to some necessity of defence or controversy, but also in theory in conformity to the true idea of theology whose proper object consists in revealed truth *principia revelata sibi a Deo.* Sum. th., Ia, q. I, a. 2" 2. This advance of the positive method is particularly noticeable in Suarez [3].

CHAPTER III.

Renaissance Dominican Theologians before the Council of Trent.

Special Bibliography: see the notes for each author.

I. DOCTRINAL LIFE OF THE ORDER AT THE RENAISSANCE.

During the XVth century the doctrinal activity of the Dominican Order was at a low ebb. At this period there was a general decadence of theology and philosophy: "The Thomist school and the Order of Preachers were unable to escape the general conditions of the historical period they were traversing. They suffered a weakening in the quantity and quality of their theological output. Yet the Order still managed to retain, even in the XVth century, a noteworthy doctrinal vitality. At this juncture the Preachers produced such men as John Capreolus, St. Antony of Florence and Juan de Torquemada" [4].

[1] *Regi, d'orlh..,* xi. See below, p. 764.
[2] See below, p. 781.
[3] X. Le Bachelet, *Jésuites,* in *Diet, th.,* col. 1044.
[4] Mandonnet, *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 905.

John Capreolus* (d. 1444) born in the Diocese of Rodez, a theologian who taught for some time in Paris but lived for the most part at the monastery of Rodez where he died, earned the title of *princeps thomistarum* by reason of his 4 books of *Defensiones.* This work, planned as a commentary of Lombard "is a penetrating explanation of St. Thomas's teachings and a defence against the various adversaries who had attacked the head of the school since the end of the xmth century" [1].

Saint Antony [3] (1389-1459) a Dominican of Florence and Archbishop of that town, was the author of many moral treatises and especially a *Summa theologica moralis* in 4 books (On the soul; on sins; on states of life and punishments; on virtue) : This work was immensely popular, owing to the author's practical turn of mind.

Juan de Torquemada (Turre-cremata)[4] (1388-1468) Master of the Sacred Palace, counsellor to Eugenius IV and his successors, and cardinal of Saint Sistus was an eminent theologian as is witnessed by his numerous writings.

Jerome Savonarola[5] (1452-1498) in addition to other opuscula, wrote a remarkable apologetical work, the *Triumphus crucis.* This man who was a genius and lived a life of heroic virtue might have been a saint, had he not been a "visionary" in the worst sense of the word, carried even to revolt by his excessive fervour.

"From the end of the XVth century the doctrinal life of the Dominicans was infused with a new strength which culminated in the XVIth century and lost little of its force throughout the two following centuries [6]. The reasons for this revival are many : the close relationship between the Order and the universities in every country : the adoption of St. Thomas's *Summa* as text book[7]; and in a more general way the influence of humanism [8], particularly sensible in the case of the authors of the Thomist revival in Spain and a number of the Italian Dominican theologians. *Cajetan* who was to the forefront in this revival was one of those in whom the influence of this humanism was less apparent. His work "still retains the medieval expository

* Hurter, *Nomenclator** π, 805-806. Mandonnet, *Capreolus** in *Did. th.** col. 1694. Cf. PÈGUES, in *Rev. thorn.** 1899-1900.

[1] MANDONNET, *ibid.** Re-edition of the *Defensiones* by Paban and Pegues, 7 vols, Tours, 1900-1908.

[3] Hurter, *op. cit.** 11, 957-959. Mandonnet, *Antonin (S.)** *va* *Did. theol.** col. 1450-1454. R. Morçay, *Antonin (S.),* in *Did. Hist.** col. 856-860.

[4] Hurter, *op. cit.** n, 880-884. This theologian should not be confused with Thomas de Torquemada (1420-1498), his kinsman, Inquisitor in Jpain and author of various works on the Inquisition.

[5] Hurter, *op. cit.** 11, 1096-1100. F. Vernet, *Savonarole** in *Did. Apol.** col. 1214-1229. —[6] Mandonnet, *op. cit.** col. 905.

[7] See above, p. 731. — [8] Mandonnet, *ibid.** col. 908 sq.

method. He certainly ranks as a theologian of the transition on account of his originality and personal independence; but both his method and his style were still medieval and it is to this, as well as to his unrivalled gifts, that he owes his superiority, even when compared with the great Thomists of the new era" L

IL DOMINICAN THEOLOGIANS OUTSIDE SPAIN.

A). Cajetan (1468-1534)2.

Tommaso de Vio, born at Gaeta, and future cardinal of this town, from whence he takes his usual name of Cajetanus, entered the Dominican Order as a youth. When he had finished his philosophical and theological studies he was called upon to teach theology at Padua. Fiere he commented the *Book of Sentences* in 1493 and became a Bachelor in the same year. He then went on to teach Metaphysics. He had the glory of defeating the pretentious humanist, Pico della Mirandola, in public disputation. He also combated, especially by means of his commentary of St. Thomas's *De ente et essentia,* the form of Scotism professed at Padua by the famous Franciscan Trombetta (d. 1518), as well as Averroism which had many exponents in the university. Summoned to Pavia in 1497 at the instance of his patron, the Duke of Milan, he was named procurator of his Order in 1500 and went to live in Rome. He nevertheless continued his teaching until he was made vicar-general of the Order in 1507 and *Master General* a year later. He was then aged forty years. During his ten years of office he put fresh life into the studies of the Order. Lie himself set the example. In spite of the cares of administration he continued his commentary of the *Summa* which dates almost entirely from this period. He defended the rights of the Iloly See, threatened by the Pseudo-Council of Pisa (1511-1512) convoked by the enemies of Julius II. In 1517 Leo X made him a *cardinal* and sent him into Germany as a legate. This mission, which was mainly diplomatic and which lasted from May 1518 until September 1519 brought Cajetan face to face with Luther

1 P. Mandonnet, *ibid.*

,* Hurter, *Nomenclator,* π, 1201-1209. P. Mandonnet, *Cajetan,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 1311-1329.

(October 1518). In spite of his moderation, the only possible and prudent attitude he could adopt with the unbalanced monk, the legate failed to obtain a retractation. On his return, Cajetan was made *Bishop of Gaeta* and resided for the most part in Rome. Under Adrian VI (1522-1523) he was again given a mission in Central Europe (1523-1524) But during the pontificate of Clement VII (1523-1534) he led a much quieter life, wholly given to study, especially of Holy Scripture. He died in 1534.

Cajetan's literary ouput was considerable. His works, however, have not as yet been brought together in a complete edition. Fr. Mandonnet, mentions: *a) Philosophy:* 11 different writings, youthful works consisting mainly in commentaries on Aristotle and St. Thomas; *ti) Theology:* 82 writings, opuscula and treatises, among which the great *Commentary on the Summa theologica'.* Cajetan's text, save for a few censured passages, was published together with the *Summa* in the edition of Pius V, 1570; all of it is to be found in the Leonine edition; *c") Exegesis:* lastly, the commentary of most of the historical books of the Old Testament, and several prophetic and poetic writings; in the New Testament, commentaries of the four Gospels, the Acts and the Epistles, a vast work in which the theologian made good use of critical sources.

It is mainly as a theologian and philosopher that Cajetan enters into the scope of this work. From this doctrinal viewpoint two traits seem to sum up his character. First, his *deep scholastic and Thomist learning,* Pie paid little attention to style but was profoundly interested in ideas, which he explained clearly and methodically; he possessed a rare subtility, whetted in his brushes with the Scotists, a nobility of thought that gave him complete serenity" even when vexed with irritating problems and enabled him to take a complete view of any question. He was an admirer of St. 'I liornas and generally clung to his opinion, though not rabidly. In reality, Cajetan—and this is the second trait of his character—sometimes surprises the reader by the *boldness* of the new opinions he emits in every· field of learning, opinions which aroused the criticism even of his own brethren.

Catharinus disapproved mainly of his *exegetical* teaching and succeeded in having it twice condemned (1533 and 1542) by the Faculty ofTheology of Paris. Catharinus however was narrow-minded. Melchior Cano also thought to reproach him with "adopting a new

l The commentary of the I* was finished in May I5°7> that of the II* in 1517 and that of the in* in 1522.

meaning, *a torrente doctorum sacrorum alienus,* although it may have been based on the text and not opposed to the Scriptures and the teaching of the Church " yet we can well suppose that Cajetan's views were sounder than Cano's[1]. Nevertheless, Cajetan's adventurous mind, influenced by Scotus and Ockham, came to maintain that reason alone, without faith, is unable to demonstrate the *soul's immortality* and that *angels* have an airlike *body.* In theology, similarly, he confessed to be unable to see a real proof of the *Real Presence* in the words of Christ at the Last Supper : " non apparere ex Evangelio coactivum aliquod ad intelligendum hæc verba proprie". And as regards *Baptism* he taught that the outwardly manifested faith of the parents might take the place of the sacrament. These arc the doctrines—and some others—new, rash and even false—that Pius V caused to be suppressed in the 1570 edition. Owing to their little general interest, they did not diminish Cajetan's authority among the Thomist school, and this authority was confirmed and, were it possible, increased by Leo XIII.

Among the doctrines made popular by Cajetan was his theory of personality[2] or subsistence. He considers subsistence as a *substantial modality,* really distinct from the complete nature, which it directly prepares for the reception of existence. This doctrine of the three realities (essence, subsistence, existence) as it is called, is now usual among Thomists. It had its repercussion on Cajetan's *Trinitarian theology* and caused him to affirm that in God there are three relative subsistences as well as an absolute subsistence common to the three Persons. *Suarez* seized upon the theory of the substantial modality and generalised it, in order to obviate the defects in his metaphysics arising from his fundamental negation of all real distinction between essence and existence [3].

B). Divers authors.

I. Silvester of Ferrara [4] *(Ferrariensis)* (1474-1526), was possibly, after Cajetan, the theologian in whom the Thomist revival found its happiest expression. After having been professor for a long period at Bologna he became Master General in 1525, but died in the following year while visiting the houses of the Order. He composed several philosophical studies (notes on various treatises of Aristotle...) but his masterpiece is the *Commentary of the Summa contra Gentiles* [5], which is a classic of its kind.

1 M. Cano, *de locis theol.,* bk. VII, c. 3. Mandonnet, *op. cit.,* col. 1328. This author remarks that Cajetan's method may now be regarded as " the usual method of Catholic exegetes ".

2 See A. Michel, *Hypostase,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 411-417. Léon Mahieu, *F. Suarez,* p. 249 sq.

3 See below.

4 Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 11, 1212-1213.

5 Added to the text in the Leonine edition.

2. With these almost official commentators of St. Thomas, Cajetan and Silvester, may be compared Conrad. Kollin [1]* (1476-1536). He taught for many years at Heidelburg and Cologne and in 1512 published an acute and penetrating commentary of the Ia-Hæ. The remainder of his work has never been edited, for he was no doubt forestalled by Cajetan. Towards the end of his life Kollin entered the lists actively against Luther, particularly when the apostate married' and began to emit false teaching on matrimony.

3. Javelli[3] (d. after 1538) spent most of his life as professor and regent of studies at Bologna about the time when Cajetan as general of the Order was reviving its intellectual interests. The two men held very similar views, though towards the end Javelli turned against his superior on account of the latter's adventurous scriptural exegesis. The majority of his writings are philosophical with a definite though not exclusive Aristotelian tendency. His intellectual broadmindedness aided him in his contacts with the hardened Averroist, Pomponazzi, who finally accepted the doctrine of the soul's immortality[4]. In theology, Javelli's Commentary of the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa* brought him less renown than his opusculum *De Dei prædestinatione et reprobatione,* and explanation of quest. XXIII of the *Summa* (Ia P.), which is the purest Molinism, before its time. Javelli could find no other means of answering the Lutherans. The majority of Dominicans did not take kindly to these modifications and several protested.

4. Ambrosius Catharinus [5]. (1487-1553) is the foremost representative of the new tendencies with which humanism imbued certain XVith century theologians, particularly as regards the question of grace and predestination. Mandonnet terms this movement *Catharinism.*

After brilliant scholastic attainments in law, achieved in Italy and France, *Lanceletto Politi* became consistorial advocate at Rome. He was on the threshold of a great career, when suddenly at the age of thirty he turned his back on honours and became a Dominican (1517). Out of devotion to St. Ambrose and St. Catherine he took the name of *Ambrosius Catharinus,* under which name he is best known. He began to attract attention by his writings against Luther *(Apologia* 1520; *Excusatio disputationis,* 1521; *Speculum hareticorum,* 1532). After 1530 he crossed swords with Cajetan and in order to fight from a safe distance went to Paris in 1534. Against him he wrote a volume of *Annotationes* and obtained his condemnation by the Faculty of Theology. He engaged in many other controversies, with the Dominicans for the most part. He was made bishop by Paul III in 1546 and archbishop in 1552 by Julius III his former pupil, and took a fairly prominent part in the Council of Trent. Under cover of powerful

* Hurter, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 1210-1212.

' i. e., *Adversus caninas M. Lutheri nuptias,* Tübingen, 1530.

3 Hurter, *ibid.,* 1209-1210. M. D. Chenu, */avelli,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 535-537. — 4 See below, p. 716.

J Hurter, *ibid.,* 1378-1383. P. Mandonnet, *Frères Prêcheurs,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 909-916.

patronage he allowed himself doctrinal excursions which he would not have tolerated in others. He died in 1553.

The ideas of Catharinus were as fertile as they were personal. He wrote on a great number of theological questions and his opuscula and treatises usually contain fresh and original opinions, occasionally overstepping the bounds of prudence. The best known of his doctrines are the following : *a)* that man can know that he is in a state of grace [1] by divine faith, a faith that is private, not Catholic and not specifically revealed ; *b)* original sin consists in the actual sin of Adam extrinsically imputed to his descendants; *c)* the exterior intention of the minister suffices for valid administration of the sacraments. We need hardly say that Catharinus defended the Immaculate Conception and the Scotist teaching on the motive of the Incarnation against tbe Dominican school. He accentuated Javelli's ideas on predestination : he distinguishes two kinds of predestination; one *absolute* applying to some whom God certainly wills to save; the other relative, applying to all others who maybe saved, but whose number has not been fixed by the will of God. This curious and incoherent teaching entirely reflects the eccentric character of its author.

III. THE SPANISH DOMINICANS.

THE EARLY THOMIST SCHOOL AT SALAMANCA.

Humanism found a particularly fertile soil in the XVIth century Spanish Dominicans. The centre of the movement was Salamanca; the pioneer was *Vittoria* who was so desirous of giving fresh life to theology that he sometimes did not hesitate even in doctrinal matters to create new teaching[2]. The reaction against this tendency came from Bannez at the end of the century, also at Salamanca.

Francis of Vittoria[3] (1480-1546) Spanish Dominican, educated at the University of Paris obtained the first chair of the Faculty of Theology in open competition in 1524. He took as his manual, St. Thomas's *Summa* and during the 22 years that he held his eminent position, he wielded a powerful intellectual influence not only in the University but

[1] C. J. Van der meersch, *Grâce,* in *Did. thiol.,* col. 1619. The Council of Trent does not seem to have condemned this opinion : it merely lays down: a) that no Catholic is bound to believe himself justified; *b)* that every Catholic may fear. — Fr. Mandonnet even uses the word, revolution' : *of>. cit.,* col. 90S.

[3] Hurter, *Nomenclator,* π, 1367-1370. MANDONNET, *of). cit.,* col. 908 sq.

throughout the whole of Spain. He published nothing : his *12 Kelectiones theologica* did not appear until 1557. Yet out of his teaching and method alone, grew a school of thought. Treating St. Thomas as the latter had treated Peter Lombard, he refrained from following the text sentence by sentence, preferring to envisage the whole question in his own particular manner, explaining it with ample developments. When he saw fit, Vittoria had no scruple in differing from his beloved Doctor (on the way in which grace is augmented, the revival of merits, divine co-operation, freewill etc.). This eclecticism was probably due to humanistic influences and his Parisian masters, especially *Crockaert,* a native of Brussels, who, beginning as a Nominalist, was converted to Thomism when he became a Dominican between the age of 35 and 40.

Vittoria's most illustrious disciple^ who succeeded him at Salamanca, was Melchior Cano [1] (1509-1560). He occupied the first chair of Theology from 1546 to 1552. He had studied under Vittoria at Salamanca from 1527 to 1537. We need only mention in passing his disputes with his colleague Carranza before and even after the latter's elevation to the archiépiscopal see of Toledo[2]. Being in great favour at the court of Philip II, he possessed great doctrinal influence in Spain, a power which he used especially against the *Alumbrados* [3] and even all mystical movements [4]. He himself, nevertheless, wrote an elegant but strangely cold spiritual work : *On Self Conquest*\ dealing with the combat against the seven capital sins, a theme familiar to humanists. But it was in his *De Locis theologicis* that Cano showed himself to be a great theologian and humanist. He had great classical gifts and a delightful purity of style; the early scholastic methods[6] were little to his taste and he thought them hardly suited for the refutation of Protestants. His keen perception of these defects and his own talents gave rise to a new project, a work which was to turn theology to a more precise examination of its revealed foundations. He was prevented from completing his treatise[7] by his early

[1] Hurter, *ibid.,* 1370-1372, P. Mandonnet, *Cano (Melchior),* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 1537-154°· M. Jacquin, *Melchior Cano et la théologie moderne,* in *Rev. sc. phil. théol.,* 1920 (v. ix), p. 121-141. A. Gardeil, *Lieux théol.,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 712-747.

[2] See P. Mandonnet. *op. cit.* —[3] [4] For this sect, see p. 790.

[4] Cf. P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 163-168.

[5] Fr. trans., M. Legendre, Paris, 1923.

[6] He often criticised them, especially Cajetan and even St. Thomas, whom he nevertheless revered as the perfect theologian.

[7] It was published in 1563. The second part was barely begun when the author died.

death in 1560. He had previously been nominated Bishop of the Canaries (1552) but he resigned a month later, before taking possession of his see.

The "De Locis theologicis" [1] dealing entirely with the study of the sources of theological arguments, is, in reality, a treatise of theological method. Cano sets out and classifies these sources with admirable and lucid judgment; of these *loci* he enumerates ten, each of which is dealt with in a separate book, preceded by Book I which forms a kind of general introduction : Holy Scripture, π ; Tradition, HI; the Catholic Church, iv; Councils, V; the Roman Church, vi; the Fathers, VII; the Scholastic theologians, Vili ; reason, IX ; philosophers, X ; and history, XI. As the reader will notice, the first seven *loci* alone are proper to theology ; the last three are ancillary and are the instruments of all true learning. Among the first a greater importance must be given to Holy Scripture and Tradition which virtually contain and are made clearer in those that follow. In three further chapters the author planned to treat of the use of these *loci* \w scholastic disputations, in the explanation of Holy Writ, and in controversy against the enemies of the faith. Of these he was to complete only Book xii, dealing with the speculative and practical knowledge of each of these sources that should be possessed by the scholastic theologian*.

By' his creation of this instrument of *loci theologici,* Cano may be counted as the pioneer of modern theology. He maintains, of course, the *traditional definition* of theology, to which he assigns " a threefold end, corresponding exactly to the scholastic concept, or speculative theology : the extraction from revealed truths of the conclusions they contain; the defence of this theology against heretics, incorporating with it all the wealth of human learning. Lastly, he claims to bring reason in contact with the data of revelation, an instinct which is natural to man. In all this he remains St. Thomas's disciple " [3]. In practice, however, *the method he* envisages is entirely *new* and gives an almost preponderating importance to simple research into the sources of faith. This is patent in the instances he provides at the end of his work: " The plan of his explanation is this : objections, proofs of each proposition by means of the *loci theologici* correspond-ing to the matter, answers to objections. The general appearance of this work is quite different from that found in the works of St. Thomas and other scholastic masters. W hilst reasoning predominates in the latter, here we have erudition. This fact alone, makes Melchior Cano the

1 Title suggested by Aristotle's *Topics.* *De loc. th.,* 1, c. 7.
s See Fr. Gardeil's article.
3 M. Jacquin, *op. cit.,* p. 135.

inspirer of *modern theology*" [1]. Hence, the manner of developing a theological thesis, employed by all at the present time; three series of proofs: Scripture, Tradition, reason. Cano's initiative has thus been fruitful and valuable, for he cannot be held as wholly responsible for the misuse that has been made of this method[2]. Although he introduced a new method, Cano had little taste for novelty in doctrine[3].

Dominic Soto[4] (1494-1560) was already renowned as a master in philosophy and theology when he became a Dominican in 1524. He came to the fore at the Council of Trent (ist period, 1545-1547) when he faced up to Catharinus who had gathered around him a group of theologians who opposed St. Thomas's teaching on grace. Not only was St. Thomas not condemned in the Council but his influence is evident in lhe drawing up of the decree of the important sixth session on justification. Soto even made an open attack on Catharinus' teaching on the certainty of the state of grace. In 1552 he succeeded to the Chair of Theology at Salamanca, left vacant by Cano who had been made a bishop after the Council. He occupied it until his death (1560). He rapidly acquired great doctrinal authority, which was spread abroad by his various theological writings (De natura et gratia, 3 books; In Epistola ad Rom.; Disceptationes; Comment, of the 4 Books of Sentences). Though he remained constant in his opposition to Scotus, Ockham and Catharinus, Soto himself did not altogether avoid the *taint of eclecticism,* and this in a grave subject: he did not admit the real distinction of essence and existence and went so far as to say he did not perceive its importance. But in his fine treatise *De natura et gratia* dedicated to the Council of Trent, he maintained the intrinsic efficacy of grace: this he explains by insisting on a kind of moral and objective influence or predetermination, rather than the physical influx of divine cooperation [5].

Peter de Soto or de Sotomayor[6] (1518-1563) Dominic's namesake[7] and his successor at Salamanca in 1560, seems to have followed the

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 136. — [2] By giving undue importance to arguments from authority.

[3] M. Mahieu sees in this the reason for his lively attacks on the Company of Jesus. *Suarez,* p. 34-35. Yet Cano himself was in some matters an innovator, when he taught *e. g.,* that the marriage contract is separable from the sacrament and that the priest is the minister of the latter. *Loc. theol.,* bk. v, c. 8. He was also the first to propose lhe expression "moral causality", which had some popularity in later sacramental theology. Cf. P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 173 sq.

[4] Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 11, 1372-1374. A. Viel, *L). Soto,* in *Ptev. thorn.,* 1904, 1905, 1906.

[5] Non ad se nos Deus trabit ut pecudes, ... sed illuminando, dirigendo, alliciendo, pulsando et instigando. *Op. cit.,* I, c. 15.

[6] Hurter, *Nomenclator,* 11, 1461-1463. These two Soto should not be confused with L. Sotomayor (1526-1610) a Dominican, and the Mercedarian Christopher Soto (xvitb c.), and an F. de Sotomayor, author of a *History of lhe Theban Legion.*

[7] They were not kinsmen: Dominic came of humble stock, Peter of a noble family.

same lines as Dominic: this is witnessed by his two extant letters to R. Tapper. He wrote various controversial works against the Protestants: he had been a professor at Dilligen and lived in England under Queen Mary.

Bartholomew Medina[1] (1528-1580) was also a professor at Salamanca where he occupied the first chair of theology after 1576, and published a number of commentaries.

His theological renown is clue to the fact that he passes as the first to have formulated the theory of probabilism. And indeed, in one of his dissertations he states this thesis: "It seems to me that if an opinion is *probable,* it may be followed, even should the contrary opinion be more probable"[2]3 From this, very different conclusions have been drawn, accordingly as "probable" is taken to mean *relatively doubtful,* or *certain in merely contingent matters.* The protagonists of probabilism in moral theology take it in the first sense, which Medina perhaps would not have admitted, just as D. Soto refused to admit it. The adversaries of probabilism hold that Medina admitted only the second interpretation and do not regard him as the founder of the moralists' absolute probabilism[3].

CHAPTER IV.

The Thomist Theologians of Grace.

Special Bibliography: see the notes for each author.

I. BANNEZ ANI) HIS SCHOOL.

The Dominican theologians at the end of the XVIth century bravely fought against all tendencies to leave St. Thomas aside, even as regards minor points of doctrine. They were particularly anxious to discountenance all tampering with his theology of grace which was being tempered by

1 Hurter, *op. cit.,* in, 144. M.-M. Gorce, *Medina,* in *Diet, thiol.,* col. 481-485.

3 Commentary of the la-llæ, q. 19, a. 6. Cf. Gorce, *op. cit.,* 483.

3 Fr. Goree concludes thus: "Owing to the misunderstanding of certain casuists, Medina, despite himself, passes historically as the father of absolute probabilism'. In any case the question is purely one of historical interest

humanism and zealously promoted by the Jesuits in this form. These men stand out as the theelogians of grace and their foremost representative is Bannez.

Dominic Bannez [1] (1528-1604) became a Dominican at Salamanca in 1546 and studied theology there for three years. He then taught successively, in the Dominican monastery at Salamanca (1551-1561), at Avila (1561-1566), whose school had just been raised to the status of a University, at Alcala (1567-1573), at Valladolid (1573-1577), at the school of higher studies for future professors where he became regent. He then returned to Salamanca (1577) where he spent the remainder of his life, occupying the second chair of theology and then the first, from 1580 to his death in 1604. During his stay at Avila the young professor became St. Teresa's confessor (1562-1566) and the saint so appreciated his strong and enlightened guidance that until her death she continued to write to him for direction in the difficulties that beset her.

The works of Bannez consist either of *Commentaries* on the *Summa theologica**, or writings occasioned by the Molinist controversy which occupied all the last years of his life: *Apologia Prædicatorum,* 1595; *Libellus supplex,* to Clemens Vili, 1597; *Responsio ad § qucestiones de efficacia grafite divina,* unpublished ; *Respuesta...* against the Valladolid Jesuits (1602). To these works should be added the work *De merito et augmento caritatis.*

Both his intellectual qualities (logical vigour and metaphysical profundity) and his *character* (ardent and impetuous nature, a very forceful personality, setting out truth uncompromisingly) marked him out as the spokesman of the rigorous interpretation of Thomism, which, after the Council of Trent, increasingly attracted the Dominican School. The movement found its impetus on the one hand in the decree of Pius making Thomas a Doctor of the Church (1567) and on the other, in a reaction against the tendency of humanist and Jesuit theologians to attenuate the Thomist and Augustinian teaching on grace. Bannez states his determination to follow the Angelic Doctor even in points of detail; "Etiam in levioribus quæstionibus, ne latum quidem unguem a S. Doctoris doctrina unquam discesserim" [3]. He pointed out the unfortunate concessions made by all his predecessors, and became, towards the end of the XVIth century, the "oracle of the Thomist School". He felt that vigorous reaction was especially needed as regards the question af grace, and made it his business to foster it. From that time the Thomist school has followed in his footsteps.

When Molina's thesis was published and brought to his notice, Bannez, who had already taken his stand against the teaching of Prudencio de Montemayor, declared to the cardinal inquisitor of Portugal that it partly reproduced the doctrines that had already been forbidden in 15S4. It was

[1] Hurter, *op. cit.,* in, 389-391. P. Mandonnet. *Bannez,* in *Did. théol.* col. 140-145. E. Vansteenberghe, *Molinisme, ibid.,* col. 1097-1099.

[3] Ia, in 1584 and 1588: IIMI®, q. 1-46, in 1584 and q. 57-78 in 1594.

[3] I», q. 24, a. 6.

not until 1594 that the great controversies began, when the Jesuits of Vallodolid publicly defended (March 5th, 1594) Molina's theories. On May 17th the Dominicans answered them by means of a solemn disputation in the same town. The inquisitor then asked to be furnished with a memorandum of the respective teachings. Shortly afterwoods the nuncio at Madrid referred the affair to the papal court and meanwhile forbade discussion of the question under dispute. A certain delay intervened and it was not until 1596 that the affair was followed up in Rome. Spain was not alone in its anxiety for a ruling. "The whole world", says Hergenroether, "impatiently awaited the outcome". The *Congregatio de Auxiliis* however was unable to open its first sessions before 1598, and then continued until 1607. Bannez was not immediately implicated. He had, it is true, been denounced together with his colleague Zumel, a Mercedarian, to the inquisition of Seville by Molina in 1594. But his *Apologia* [1]*provided a sufficient answer to the charges against him, and the Roman assemblies had to judge merely the *De Concordia.* In his *Libellus supplex* to Clemens VIII (Oct. 1597) he had asked leave to resume his teaching on grace. This was granted him. The Jesuits also obtained the same permission in a similar manner. Bannez did not live to see the end of the Roman discussions for he died in 1604. All his life had been spent in an offensive against doctrinal innovations both within and without his Order. His name will ever remain associated with a number of precise points that have given a durable and hardy texture to the common fund of Thomism.

Among Bannez' disciples should be mentioned especially those who defended his views in the *De auxiliis* controversies :

Diego Alvarez[3] (d. 1635) a professor ror many years, was sent to Rome to combat Molina in 1596. He wrote a great number of treatises on grace. He was made Archbishop of Trani in 1616.

Thomas de Lemos [3] (1550-1629) was the chief representative of Thomism in the *De auxiliis* congregations after 1602. His versatility and power of argument made him a redoubtable opponent of the Molinists. After the discussions were finished he refused to be made a bishop and withdrew to the Minerva where he wrote "his famous *Panoplia gratia,* the fruit of painstaking erudition and speculation,

[1] *Apologia Frat. Pradicatorum in prov. Hispanice, 1595.*

[2] Hurter, *op. cit.,* in, 659-660. Mandonnet, *Alvarez,* in *Diet, thiol.,* 926-927.

Hurler, *tbid.,* 667-670. M. D. Chenu, *Lemos,* in *Diet, thiol.,* 210-211.

areal theological *Minima* of grace, based on the final conclusions which Bannez and Alvarez had drawn from the Thomist principles"

At the same period *other Dominican theologians* 2 were applying these principles somewhat differently. Their explanation was more in line with the teaching of St. Augustine. Both groups, however, were radically Augustinian and Thomist, for all the sixteenth century discussions on grace harked back to St. Augustine and also to St. Thomas. The following outline of the essential elements of these doctrines should aid the reader to understand exactly the points of difference between particular systems.

II. AUGUSTINISM AND THOMISM IN THE XVIrn CENTURY CONTROVERSIES.

Protestant errors had revived interest in St. Augustine's teaching on grace and predestination, and this teaching thus became the base for the Catholic defence. But since the time of the Bishop of Hippo new problems had been proposed to which he had given no explicit solution. Scholastic problems were mainly in question, for the theologians, although .they embraced different systems, were at one in rejecting heretical innovations. False doctrines, nevertheless, were the cause or the occasion of the discussions.

Two mains errors were set up against Catholic Augustinism 3. On the one hand was *Pelagianism* 4 against which Augustine defended with unconquerable energy the necessity of grace; what time he stressed the doctrine of original sin the better to prove his thesis. The denial of the gratuity of supernatural gifts and the rejection of predestination tended to a modified Pelagianism (later termed Semipelagianism) 5. Hence the zeal of Augustine and his disciples in affirming both these points. Yet, on the other hand, these affirmations, cut off from their historical context, led the *Protestants* in the XVlth century to deny freewill and preach fatalism in the name of grace and predestination6. Between Pelagian naturalism and the pseudo-supernaturalism

1 M. Chenu, *ibid.* —3 See below, p. 758.

3 We refer to a particular aspect of Augustinism which may well be considered on its own, without however isolating it completely from other essential points. See above, p. 357· —4 See vol. 1, p. 630.

5 See vol. I, p. 635-637 and above, p. 162 sq.

6 See above, p. 71&

of the reformers was found Catholic tradition, the accredited interpreter of St. Augustine. The Thomism which drew its inspiration from him, faithfully mirrored a traditional conception of grace that was fairly current in the Schools.

Two new doctrinal tendencies, due to the controversies aroused by the reformers, made their appearance in Catholic circles at the end of the XVIth century. Their promotors, in each case, claimed to be orthodox.

The first group, adhering to the letter rather than the spirit of St. Augustine's text, adopted a position lying between Protestantism and Thomism, but it was not long before it was condemned : Baianism, rejected by the Church, continued its work in a more subtle though not less dangerous form as *"Jansenism"* which was destined to be condemned in its turn *.

At the opposite extreme, other theologians, desirous of striking with surer aim at the Protestant errors, considerably modified St. Augustine's texts on grace, though they were careful not to fall into the excesses of Pelagian naturalism, even in its semipelagian garb: these were the Molinists. At the outset they were accused of teaching Semipelagianism. They proved this charge to be unfounded and the Holy See refused to condemn them2. Thomists, especially those in Spain, were deeply distressed at this new conception of grace and reacted energetically 3. They did not fear to have recourse to new and particularly outspoken expressions of doctrine in order to rule out the more surely a teaching they judged to be perilous, compromising, and'false. In adding these refinements to Thomism, Bannez played an outstanding part. In any attempt to grasp them thoroughly the controversa! necessities that gave them birth must not be overlooked.

The Augustinian theological schools of teaching on grace were somewhat numerous. All Catholic theologians invoke St. Augustine and even the Molinists were able to find in his works a number of texts in favour of liberty which they could legitimately use. They differed, however, from the *Augustinians in the true sense of the word**, by their tendency to modify the more characteristic Augustinian expressions on the efficacy of grace. 'The Bishop of Hippo explains this efficacy by always considering it from the divine angle, whilst the Molinists deliberately make it conditional on man's consent : no doubt this consent is forestalled and accompanied by grace, but Molinists hold that it is due

' See below, p. 864. We need not discuss it in detail here.

3 See following chapter.

3 The Molinist system was occasioned by the need of engaging! n controversy : lhe Thomist precision of doctrine was due to the theologians' anxiety to maintain the traditional positions. Both these tendencies, *in se,* are legitimate and good.

4 See below, p. 672 Molina's statements.

to this consent that grace ceases to be purely sufficient and becomes efficacious. Efficacy is thus given to grace *ab extrínseco:* such is the specific clement of Molinism, the rejection of which characterises the truly Augustinian schools : the latter affirm the efficacy of grace *ab intrinseco*^ due to the quality proper to this grace.

We shall mention no more than *three Augustinian schools.* Two of them are associated with St. Thomas : first, *common Thomism* which is currently explained in the majority of commentaries of the *Summa* from the XVIth century, and secondly a modified form of Thomism which we shall call *Augustinian congruism.* The latter must not be confused with a special interpretation of St. Augustine's texts on grace made in the xviith and xvmth century by a few theologians of the Augustinian Order : hence the name of *Augustinianism* as \vc propose to call it.

The efficacy of grace " ab intrinseco " is one of the doctrinal points admitted by these diverse Augustinian schools. A more general characteristic common to them all is *supernatural optimism*[2] In these schools it is not usual to stress to such an extent as in other theological circles, the goodness, even the relative goodness, of human nature. St. Augustine indeed, may perhaps have fallen into the opposite excess, the better to combat the naturalism of Julian of Eclanum. Yet these schools teach an unshakeable faith and confidence in the divine goodness and mercy, and count on the abundance and efficacy of the succour that God vouchsafes for the salvation of men.

This grace possesses a universal and all-embracing activity. It precedes the act of the will and accompanies it in the accomplishment of every supernaturally good act. It is possible to distinguish three functions of grace in impelling a man to act; it must : I. raise the faculty to the supernatural plane and assist it to produce its act ; 2. move the faculty in the act itself; 3. sweep aside any obstacle that might hinder the act[a]. Though all the schools attribute this threefold

[1] Sec vol. 1, p. 664-665, and 693. Better than all systems, this frank optimism appears to be calculated to dissipate fears in these matters and leaves the mind entirely free in face of the great and impenetrable mystery of grace.

[2] " In the total work of actual grace may be considered, I repeat, three distinct functions : it raises the faculty to the supernatural order and makes its potential virtuality directly *proportional* to the entity of the act which is to be accomplished; in the second place, it communicates to the faculty an *impulse* capable of making it pass from the potential and static state and impel it dynamically to the second act (actus secundus); lastly it brushes aside *all hindrance, á*\\ resistance that may be set up by freewill against the movement of grace, aud brings the actuated faculty effectively and infallibly to the accomplishment of the salutary act which constitutes the ultimate term
II. GUILLERMIN, *Rev. thorn.*. 1902, p. 636. See following page.

influence to grace they do not all explain it in the same way. Grace has still another function. Not only does it move the will to the general good but also to the particular end of all *individual good acts,* and Ihomists do not hesitate to call this predetermination in the sense of premotion x.

All the Augustinians are also agreed in ascribing a twofold activity of grace on the will with regard to *the way* in which the latter is moved. First, there is an *objective, action* which is carried out by means of a presentation of the good, whose attractions determine the will to seek it2. Secondly, *a subjective action* "consisting in a modification directly produced in the will, changing its intrinsic disposition. To this is also given the name of *physical* influence, since it is carried out by a kind of entitative contact of God's active power with the activity of the human will which it bends in this or that direction" 3.

These two influences do not exclude but rather complement each other. Yet one aspect may be stressed more than the other according to the end in view. *St. Augustine* threw the objective influence into relief by his frequent use of the word "delectatio": yet this delectation or delight which has its source in the object, is made complete by means of an interior attraction which contains the subjective movement itself4. *St. Thomas,* adopting a more metaphysical terminology, prefers to stress the idea of movement, and draws attention to the subjective influence *(motio ad exercitium)* of grace, though not forgetting the other *(motio ad specificationem)* which prepares and accompanies it. When his disciples speak of *physical premotion* they interpret his meaning correctly.

The majority of Augustinians also accepted the distinction between sufficient and efficacious grace, which was proposed in the XVIth century 5: They even intensified it, the better to militate against the theory of the efficacy of grace due to consent *ab extrínseco:* They saw in efficacious grace a special assistance which is lacking in the other, and which is not the effect but the source *(intrinsic)* of consent. The nature of this internal specific element of grace is variously explained in the Augustinian schools, as will

1 They identify these two expressions.

3 Also called, less precisely, *moral action,* in contrast to physical action. See H. Guillermin, *op. cit.,* p. 383-384.

3 *Ibid.,* p. 378.

4 Delectation may be considered either in the object which causes it, or in the faculty in which it is found.

5 In a very wide sense *sufficient grace* is that which precedes the act of the will; *efficacious (¡race* is that which, in fact, is followed by the act.

be said; all, however, admit it in principle[1], and in this again they differ from the Molinists. Other divergences spring from the solutions proposed to associated problems, such, for instance, as that of predestination, which can never be wholly separated from that of grace.

III. THE VARIOUS AUGUSTINIAN SCHOOLS.

A). Common Thomism[2][3]

I. That Thomism which is mainly represented by Bannez and followed by the majority of Dominican theologians insists before all on efficacious grace and underlines the physical nature of its activity. Molinism attributes the efficacy of grace to human consent and thus distinguishes sufficient from efficacious grace by a principle which is alien to both. The better to offset this theory, common Thomism shows how they differ internally. Sufficient grace disposes the faculty and makes it capable of performing an act; but the act itself, effective activity, is due solely to efficacious grace which sweeps on the will by means of a real physical impulse and rides roughshod over all obstacles. This subjective influence, of course, must not be separated from the objective influence, in the absence of which "there could be no moral activity"; but, were the former lacking "no act would be effectively produced"[3].

This physical influence in no wise makes an automaton of the will, even when determining it to some particular good, for it does not impose a cut-and-dried volition but rather an act which the will must

[1] They all admit similarly that the expressions *infallibiliter, inimpedibilitcr, insuperabiliter, indeclinabilitir* as used by early authors do not prejudice liberty: "Once and for all, I would like to say", says Fr. Guillermin, "that these expressions must be understood in relation to the concrete act and happening, taking place without fail, and not with regard to the faculty, as if it no longer preserved its power of resistance". *Rev. thorn.*, 1902, p. 672 (note).

[2] See the treatises mentioned in *Special Bibl. Jor St. Thomas,* p. 528. The following doctrinal outline is mainly based on Fr. Guillermin S remarkable study on *La grâce suffisante*—in *Rev. thorn.,* 1901, p. 5°5*5I9> I902> P· 47'76 (Jansenist and Molinist theories), 377-404 (common Thomism); 1902, p. 654-675 and 1903, p. 20-31 (Thomism, second manner). Attention has also been paid to certain recent discussions: See R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Dieu,* I923> p. 791-847; *Rev. thorn.,* 1928, p. 193-210.

[3] II. F. Guillermin, *op. cit.,* (1902), p. 383-384. "The moral agent, no less than others, needs moving to action: but the moral agent, in addition, requires a previous knowledge of the object and motives of the act it is to accomplish and which is to be accepted by the will". *Ibid.,* p. 384.

accomplish of itself in keeping with its own nature*. Free-will is not prejudiced, since "the divine impulsion does not decide the will to produce this volition by imposing an inclination limiting its power of willing"3. On the other hand, independence with regard to God is not an essential condition of liberty : "The essences of things are defined solely by their intrinsic constitution, without any reference to their first external cause"3. Divine intervention in no wise modifies "the relation of the free act to its immediate cause, i. e., reason and will"4. After all, everything that Molinists may say of the will with regard to its act, while it is producing it, before it has produced it, and after it has produced it, we also can say : everything, save one, i. e., that possible or actual, present or future consent is independent of God, the prime mover 5, and depends only on created will. That we shall never dare to admit, for to our mind, it is an insult to God and reverses the essential order of causes"6.

Efficacious grace implies sufficient grace, or at least contains all the latter's virtualities in an eminent manner; but it goes farther still. Sufficient grace finds its necessary complement in efficacious grace, for of itself it can give only the capacity for action and is essentially and entitatively inferior. All the distance that lies between potentiality and actuality separates these two graces. As often as an act is produced and volition elicited, efficacious grace has added its complement to sufficient grace. The definition of the latter is obtained by contrasting it, as it were, with the former, the better to observe its essential nature; care must be taken however not to confuse sufficient grace in general with *purely sufficient grace* 7. Neither of these produces an act; the difference is that although purely sufficient grace attains its immediate end, the real capacity for action, it is nevertheless deprived of its extrinsic end, for the attainment of which the complementary action of efficacious grace is needed.

2. In reality, the more the difference between sufficient and efficacious grace is stressed, the more clearly must be marked the relations that unite them8. Failure to doso would constitute a betrayal of Thomist thought. These relations do not enter into their definition, being no more than properties. Yet these properties are *essential.* These

* *Ibid.,* p. 387. — 3 *Ibid.* — 3 *Ibid.,* p. 388. — 4 *Ibid.*

5 See R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Le dilemme : "Dieu déterminant ou Dieu déterminé"*. in *Rev. th.,* 1928, p. 193-210.

6 H. F. Guillermin, *op. cit.,* p. 389.

7 *Ibid.,* p. 396. The Jansenists always understood it in this restricted sense and thus plunged themselves into a gulf of misunderstanding. — 8 *Ibid.,* p. 395 sq.

two graces, indeed, must not be imagined as belonging to two different and dissimilar orders. They both " make part of a single plan of Divine Providence and both tend to the same end, the production of the same salutary free act. Sufficient grace must ordinarily precede efficacious grace in order to prepare and adapt the potentiality to the act which efficacious grace will cause it to produce. In the plan of divine mercy efficacious grace is, as it were, the *natural complement of* sufficient grace and will *always follow it,* provided the creature does not deliberately place obstacles in the way of their mutual concatenation " L

Sufficient grace, therefore, plays no small part. It raises the faculties to the supernatural plane and directly disposes them to produce their act. " It paves the way for efficacious grace, and, as it were, brings the latter in its train by reason of the law, set up by divine mercy and wisdom, that every force evolves to its own perfection and that God moves natures and faculties according to their capabilities. In consequence it may be said that *it brings with it the very act,* not of course directly, but *indirectly* by means of efficacious grace which is bound to follow if not impeded by man"3. Although for the speculative theologian, busy with his distinctions, sufficient grace is essentially that which does not produce the act, for the moral theologian, the ascetic and the mystic, who look at it from a *practical* viewpoint, sufficient grace is essentially that which precedes and prepares t re act and suffices to call forth the efficacious grace that is necessary for its production.

3. It may be asked, therefore, why the latter is not always granted in practice. And the answer lies in the *hindrances* placed in its way by the will. " Before the reception of efficacious grace and concomitantly with sufficient grace, our will, by reason of its natural activity, applies itself to the attainment of some futile or unlawful good; and despite the inspirations and indeliberate instincts that tend to draw us in the opposite direction, despite the intermittent and more or less reasoned remorse of our conscience, we allow ourselves to be involved in temptation and finally our free-will decides to choose some earthly good in preference to divine good and duty"3. This obstinate clinging to evil ultimately constitutes the obstacle to efficacious grace.

It may be objected however that according to the Thomists themselves the *chicj obstacle* to efficacious grace lies in predestination and the fact that *God does not will* to grant it to all4. But this is not the case; *in the real order of execution,* says Alvarez, God never denies sufficient and efficacious grace to anyone, unless grace is deliberately hindered by created will. No doubt this is true, but does that alter the case if God has *positively decided* not to give efficacious grace to all? God, knowing the weakness of man whom He willed to create, decided not to lead all men to salvation in reality, and this even *before* He knew their real faults (or better, *independently* of this knowledge). There is a determined

' *Ibid.,* p. 396. —3 H. F. Gu ii.l e r min , p. 399·
3 *Ibid.,* p. 400. —4 *Ibid.,* p. 397 9·

number of the elect who alone will receive the efficacious grace necessary for salvation. Had God willed to save all men effectively, He could have done so. " Cur ergo non fecit ", asks St. Augustine. " Quia noluit. Cur noluit? Penes ipsum est'". Yet all this is true only in *the order of intention* and in a *purely negative sense.* Yet in spite of all, we have here the great mystery in all its starkness. No theologian can avoid it;[3] some systems conceal its rigour; but common Thomism hides nothing, lest it should seem to lessen the rights of God.

4. We may perhaps find a *confirmation* of this interpretation of Thomism, which may be summed up as the concept of the intrinsic efficacity of grace, in the passivity which sets the saints apart, a passivity, which far from hindering their activity, stimulates and perfects it. Activity is the touchstone of love; but the most perfect acts[3] are not those in which free-will takes the initiative but those which it carries out under the most intense divine impulsion. Who does not know the bold confidence of souls who feel that they depend on God alone? When St.Paul said: "Quis me separabit a caritate Christi ", remarks Fr. Guillermin[4], he was obviously putting his faith in the efficacy of God's grace rather than in his own will. Indeed, the saints, the mystical authors, those Christians who are at all conscious of their weakness do not ask to be merely enlightened and stimulated; they distrust above all things the frailty, inconstancy, caprice, and indolence of their own free-will and pray God with the Church and in the liturgy to strengthen and guide their will.

To sum up, *every good and salutary act* is clue entirely both to God as first cause and entirely to man as second cause, depending absolutely on God, This dependency is the result of a physical and moral determination; more physical than moral according to St. Thomas: but moral rather than physical in the language of St. Augustine, whose viewpoint seems to be that of the internal congruism as set out by various Thomists.

' St. Augustine, *De Gen. ad litt.,* 11, c. 9.

3 "No system can avoid this conclusion. Not only the Thomists but all Catholic theologians are faced with this mystery: Why did not God decide to lead effectively all men to salvation; why does He choose some and not others?" II. Guillermin, *ibid.,* p. 398. Furthermore, since the first graces are quite gratuitous, and as final perseverance cannot be the object of strict merit, predestination, taken as a whole *(adaquate sumpta)* is also gratuitous; this is admitted by all theologians. Their differences concern only predestination to glory in se (prescinding from its preparation by faith and grace). Bossuet regarded these "abstractions" as being " useless enough after all". See above, p. 177). Even should one be less critical than Bossuet as regards these Scholastic discussions, it must be admitted that they place the problem on a very different plane from that which was usual with the Fathers, even the Augustinians, in the Vth century.

3 For St. Thomas, perfect acts are fruits of the Holy Ghost. See above, p. 613.

4 Op. cit., p. 75-76.

B) Augustinian Congruismx.

The theological system to which we give this name is fundamentally Thomist, for it maintains in this matter the essential Thomist principle, i. e., the intrinsic efficacy of grace. It has been elaborated, moreover, by convinced Thomists ever since the time of the controversies on grace, and its first official representative, Gonzalez de Albelda (d. 1622)[1][2] judged it to be more in conformity with the ideas of the early theologians than that of the disciples of Bannez himself, for he calls these *juniores thomistæ*. This teaching, moreover, is " more than any other in perfect harmony with the language and thought of the Angelic Doctor "[3]. It also corresponds excellently to those passages in which St. Augustine speaks of the adaptation of grace to the soul: "Sic eum vocat, quomodo scit ei *congruere,* ut vocantem non respuat "[4]. The systematisation we are studying here is obviously not developed by the Bishop of Hippo, for it is the result of more recent intellectual probings ; it is nevertheless truly in keeping with his viewpoint.

I. This system first differs from that which precedes as regards the question of sufficient grace, and in that undoubtedly lies its chief advantage. It " does not only bring to the free-will a complement which, in the purely potential order, makes it proportionate to the salutary act, but brings with it in addition a real impulse, by means of which the will is capable of really passing from potentiality to actuality and proceeding effectively to its operation "[5].

1 Fr. Guillermin, O. P., Dean of the Faculty of Theology at Toulouse has set out with a learning equalled by his moderation, in the above mentioned articles (p. 755) of the *Revue thomiste,* this attenuated form of Thomism which he has adopted. We give an outline of his explanation, stressing various special points.

2 *Commentaria in Sum. theol.,* Ia, q. 19, Disp. 58; vol. II, p. So sq. See Guillermin, *op. cit.,* p. 658-660. This Gonzalez., a Spanish theologian, taught in Rome at the Minerva where he was regent in 1608 (Cf. CoULON, *Gonzalez,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 1492-1493). The other protagonists of internal congruism mentioned by Guillermin are: Gonzalez de Leon, also a Spaniard, regent of the Minerva (1635-1638) author of *Controversia (De Auxiliis)* published in 1708 (in these he explicitly ascribes congruism to Sr. Augustine: v. a. 6): J. Nicolai, (1595-1673) in his *marginal notes* on the *Sum. theol.* (very many works, cf. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* p. 39-43); A. Massoulié (1632-1706) another adversary of the Jansenists, in *D. Thomas sui interpres,*

3II. Guillermin, *op. cit.,* 1902, p. 665-669.

4St. Augustine, *AdSimplicianum,* III, q· 11, 13.

5 H. Guillermin, *ibid.,* p. 655.

It is "a true physical premotion possessing everything, from the point of view of God, which enables the faculty to be the integral active principle of the salutary act"[1]* It is really sufficient, for although it is not really and actually efficacious, it is so virtually, on account of its "intrinsic quality" to such an extent that if, concomitantly with it alone, the good act is not produced, the whole fault lies with free-will which culpably and freely places an obstacle in the way of the effective activity of grace "[2].

2. Of the three functions of grace mentioned above, sufficient grace here fulfils two : efficacious grace in addition, brings to pass the third condition : the suppression of voluntary resistance. It obtains this effect by its intrinsic quality, but not by a fresh movement in the true sense of the word.

The efficacy Of grace must here be explained in a new way. "This efficacy, according to the current theory, consists in a very characteristic entity, *movement**, which remains the same in every case and infallibly actuates the faculty previously prepared by sufficient grace. But henceforth, in keeping with our new explanation, this efficacy must be made to consist in something relative and variable according to the nature and degree ot the obstacle it has to remove. In consequence the defenders of this special theory freely ascribe the efficacy of grace to a certain proportionality or congruity *(congruentia, contemperies)* with the will; to their mind, however, this is *an active and triumphant Congruity* infallibly *leading to consent,* and thus has nothing in common with the congruent grace of Suarez, which draws its efficacy from consent already foreseen by means of the *scientia media"**. Unlike that of the Molinists, Augustinian congruism is an " internal congruism ". This congruent grace, moreover, determines the will with regard not only to universal good but also to individual and *particular good,* for the latter is, and must be, a means, and the means as such is willed by the very act that wills the end and in the same degree as the end is willed[5].

3. This conception possesses great advantages. On the one hand it shews that all grace, even sufficient grace is *movement* in the true sense of the word[6]* On the other hand it throws into relief, even more successfully than

1 *Ibid.* — 3 *Ibid.*

3 As St. Thomas insists on this point, his school prefers the system elaborated by Bannez who adopts this viewpoint. —4 II. Guillermin, *ibid.,* p. 658.

5 *Sum. theol.,* IMI®, q. 8, a. 2-4. Unus et idem motus voluntatis est quo fertur *in finem* secundum quod est ratio volendi ea quæ sunt ad finem et in ipsa quæ sunt ad finem. *Ibid.,* a. 3. Voluntas movet seipsam in quantum per hoc quod vult finem reducit seipsam ad volendum ea quæ sunt ad finem. *Ibid,* q. 9, a. 4.

6 " The blessed Doctor invariably speaks of actual grace as a transitory movement, as an impulse to act, tending of itself to put the operative faculty into motion". II. Guillermin, *op. cit.,* p. 665-666.

Molinism, the *responsibility* of the will in the opposition to grace. "It no longer consists, as the Molinists have it, merely in a refusal to accede to a grace which depends on its determination alone, but in an opposition to the flow of grace which brings this consent,... opposition to an *active force* which is thus prevented from attaining the result it was about to produce" [1]. We may add that the congruist system furnishes a better explanation of the complex elements found in the production of the good act. The need of a determining movement even as regards individual good, of course remains, as it does in any grace; but in this theory less stress is given to this property of movement than to its adaptation to the actual dispositions peculiar to each soul, and the victorious and triumphant delight that accompanies it[2][3] In reality, determination is here considered in its essential effect, i. e., the *actual orientation to the end* by the effective love of a good in which the will finds its joy, at least in desire. The volition of this good virtually implies all the various particular determinations that come within its orbit [3].

This system may give rise to certain objections. Chiefly it may be said to obscure in some degree the divine *movement* as regards efficacious grace. Such is, no doubt, the reason why most Thomists, intent on rejecting Molinism and maintaining the metaphysical expressions usual with St. Thomas, have given but little heed to this system [4]. Yet the Angelic Doctor was not unaware of the other aspects of salutary activity under the divine impulse : the passages which state that the will determines itself are particularly apt[5]. This self-determination of the will does not exclude grace any more than determination by God excludes freedom of action[6]. The advantage of congruism is thus -to throw light on an aspect of the problem that is sometimes neglected by overmuch stressing of the idea of motion. Moreover, in this system

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 663-665.

[2] In congruism, grace triumphs over an obstacle that derives from freewill itself. The expression has quite a different meaning in Jansenism which suppresses free-will. Cf. Guillermin, *op. cit.,* 1903, p. 21-23.

[3] In this system, there is a virtual distinction between sufficient and efficacious grace, while in the other, a real distinction exists. *Ibid.,* 1902, p. 657.

[4] Fr. Guillermin sets out other interesting reasons, *op. cit.,* 1902, p. 669-671.

[5] See the close discussion in *Revue, thorn.,* 1927, p. 72-79 and 231-249 (A. d'Alès and P. Synave).

[6] St. Thomas opposes to "*jatal* and subject to natural laws", the expression : ^*determinata* dispositione et providentia divina". *In Joan.,* c. XIII, bk. 1. Similarly the hour of Christ's Passion was "*non ex necessitate* sed secundum divinam providentiam determinata". *Ibid.,* c. II, bk. I. See *Rev. thorn.,* 1927, p. 248-249. The word *prcedeierminari* is also used in the *De Veritale,* q. 3, a. I, and ad 7 ; q. 8, a. 12.

the infallibility of grace is preserved by the congruity of its intrinsic quality and God's knowledge of future free acts does not depend on His *scientia media* but on His predetermining decrees, a positive decree as regards good, a permissive decree as regards evil '.

As may be seen, this system is truly Thomist and provides a felicitous complement to common Thomism. Both combine in revealing in a greater measure the abundance of St. Thomas and St. Augustine. The latter's viewpoint appears to us to be more in line with the congruist system, which, however, must never be confused with the " Augustinianism " of Noris and Berti.

C) Aug'ustinianism2.

This name is given particularly to a doctrine of grace evolved in the XVHth century by CARDINAL NORIS (1631-1704) and maintained later by the theologian LAURENT Berty (1696-1766). Both were Augustinians. Though accused of Jansenism and delated to Rome, they were never condemned ; on the contrary. The first was created a cardinal by Clement X (1695) while the second obtained from Benedict XIV the famous brief of July 13th 1748 which placed the teaching of his system on the same footing as that of the Thomists and the Molinists. In reality, though it appears so akin to Jansenism, it differs essentially by its sincere affirmation of free-will. It must also be classed apart from the foregoing system, though certain elements are similar, such for instance as concern the efficacy of grace, though, even as regards this, they cannot be regarded as identical.

According to Noris, grace acts on the soul by means of delectation. Man in his present state is determined to act, either by an evil delectation *(concupiscence)* or a good and spiritual delectation *(charity).* The latter is a *sufficient grace* when it gives the power of overcoming concupiscence; it is an *efficacious grace* when in fact it is victorious, not by necessity but infallibly and irresistibly. Physical determination is thus replaced by a kind of moral determination, but in such a way as appearing to suppress all active self-determination of the soul, which lies at the mercy of one or other of these determinations.

Furthermore this teaching is bound up with other traita in which the true feebleness of the system is to be found. 1. Grace and the other privileges of our first parents were due to them not in justice but *ex decentia creatoris,* since God must act by Goodness and Wisdom. 2. Fallen man has thus not only lost the gratuitous gifts, but has

1 H. Guillermin, *op. cit.,* 1903, p. 23-30.

* Though this system evolved at a later date, we discuss it here in order to distinguish it from the foregoing. See E. Portalie, *Au^ustinianisme.* in *Diet, thiol.*› col. 24S5-2492.

suffered in his very nature. 3. Hence the absolute necessity of a grace which overcomes without physical movement by means of a victorious delectation far superior to that required in Adam. 4. God wills the salvation of all men yet does not grant truly sufficient graces to all. 5. Lastly, the law of charity is more rigorous and more general than in other theological schools.

This brief summary should at least suffice to distinguish this recent form of Augustinism from the many other systems that invoke the names of St. Augustine and St. Thomas.

CHAPTER V.

Jesuit Theologians in the XVIth century. Molinism.

Special Bibliography.

H. Hurter, *Nomenclator,* vol. in. E. Vansteenberghe, *Molinisme,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 2094-2187. X. Le Bachelet, etc., *Jésuites,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1012-1108. Special articles on each author, see the notes. The most outstanding of recent defenders of Molinism : G. Schneemann, S. J., *Controversiarum de divines gratia liberique arbitrii concordia initia et progressus,* Freiburg im B., 1881. TH. DE RÉGNON, *Bañes et Molina. Histoire, Doctrines, Critique métaphysique,* Paris, 1883. *Bannésianisme et molinisme,* Paris, 1890. A. d'Alès, *Prédestination, Providence,* in *Diet. Apol.,* col. 236-256, 445-474 *(Examen de la Prédétermination physique); Providence et libre arbitre,* Paris, 1927, Various articles in *Rech, de science relig.,* 1917, p. 1-35, etc., *Revue Thom.,* 1927, p. 231 sq. J. Stufler, S. *J., Num S. Thomas pradeterminationem physicam docuerit,* Innsbruck, 1920 (Cf. *Rev. thorn.,* 1924-1928, various notes by P. Martin, O. P.). Explanation of Molinism by a Thomist: GUILLERMIN, *La grâce suffisante,* in *Rev. thorn.,* 1902, p. 60-76. .Among contemporary theologians who admit Molinism in a greater or lesser degree are Mazella, Franzelin, Pesch, Billot.

I. THEOLOGY IN THE SOCIETY OF JESUS[1].

The Society of Jesus, founded at the time when the doctrinal reaction to Protestantism was just beginning, was destined to find one of its most powerful weapons in teaching, especially the teaching of sacred learning. And into this teaching it put that spirit of *proselytism and apostolic*

[1] See X. Le Bachelet, etc., *art. cit.,* col. 1012 sq.

zeal that seems its chief characteristic. This intense solicitude for the immediate good of souls was to lead it, not perhaps to strike out entirely new paths, but to accentuate at least certain particular tendencies that distinguished it from other Orders. In the hands of its professors, *moral theology* took on a development and practical quality hitherto unequalled [1]. On the other hand the struggle with Protestantism awakened an interest in *positive theology*, which was recommended to them by St. Ignatius himself[2], without prejudice to *speculative* or *scholastic theology* based on St. Thomas's teaching [3]. The founder of the Society in making this choice, "desired to ensure the soundness and unity of their teaching", says Le Bachelet [4]. Yet this obligation to follow St. Thomas was no more than general, and the founder's first rule was that "in every faculty the surest and most generally accepted doctrine must be followed, *securiorem ac magis approbatam doctrinam*. He counselled uniformity only as far as it was possible : *quantum fieri poterit* ". In practice, various tendencies arose and it was to avoid this and obtain doctrinal unity in the Order that between 1582 and 1598 Fr. Aquaviva caused to be drawn up the *Ratio studiorum* which renders more precise the general instructions of St. Ignatius.

In order to explain the official attitude to St. Thomas adopted by the Society, Fr. Le Bachelet remarks that in the time of Aquaviva three varying viewpoints were to be found in the Order : *a)* some theologians, the better to establish "a strict uniformity " proposed the "*pure and simple acceptation* of St. Thomas' doctrines, with the exception of one or two points" (e. g., Immaculate Conception); *b)* others saw in St. Ignatius' words the need of explaining the *text* of the *Summer* with the option, nevertheless of rejecting its assertions "whenever they found sound reasons or respectable authority for the contrary opinion"; *c)* others again adopted an *intermediate attitude :* they considered St. Thomas to be the greatest master in theology; "it is nevertheless true that assertions are found in his writings which are not *generally accepted* by others and which are not *appropriate to our times;* it would not therefore be opportune to force our brethren to maintain them all, particularly as even the Dominicans themselves are not obliged to do so". Aquaviva's ruling "gives proof of a great respect for St. Thomas and a real though not exclusive attachments to his teachings...; the intermediate opinion won the day, but with safeguards which were meant to prevent any possible abuse of the latitude which it was thought possible to leave to the masters "[5].

[1] See below, p. 737. — [2] X. Le Bachelet, *ibid.*, col. 1015. See above, p. 770. [3] *Ibid.*, col. 1012-1015, 1020 sq. — [4] *Ibid.*, col. 1020. — [5] *Ibid.*, col. 1020-1026.

This latitude allowed the theologians of the Society to take up a fairly novel position on the then so controverted question *ot grace.* Loyal to the wishes of St. Ignatius, they endeavoured to underline the role of man and his liberty in the production of even the supernatural act. Hence derives a body of propositions that constitute the doctrinal position of the Society. Fr. Le Bachelet summarises them thus: [1] "The theologians of the Society were in fact agreed, are still agreed, on these points: rejection of physical predetermination *adunum:* attribution to God of a knowledge of conditional future free acts independent of the absolute decrees: teaching of this so called *scientia media* in order to explain how the grace that God grants can possess an infallible objective connexion with the occurrence of the predefined free act, either formally or virtually", Agreement on these points however did not preclude a diversity of systems[2].

Grace is only one of the questions treated in theology. The influence of philosophy, that ancillary learning which clears the ground for the study of all dogma, is more general. The 'latitude' left to the theologians of the Society with regard to St. Thomas allowed them to abandon several points of his teaching which had been disputed by other doctors (Scotus, Ockham) or which were out of date. This resulted in a somewhat personal conception of scholasticism which came to prevail throughout the Society and found its most perfect expression in *Suarez*[3], although the Order never officially adopted his teaching nor imposed it or that of any other doctor on its members. Even since the recent indications of the sovereign pontiffs the Society still insists on a "wider interpretation of St. Thomas[4]" and no objection has been made by recent popes.

[1] *Ibid.,* col. 1027. —[3] See below, p. 767 sq. —[3] See p. 778.

[4] "Whether one claims to follow St. Thomas in everything (excepting of course the case of a contrary declaration by the Church) or whether one claims the right of disputing certain affirmations and of rejecting them on good grounds, there remains this twofold way of following St. Thomas, set out by Fr. Ledochowski: a rigorous manner, and a wider manner in which the obligation includes the *enuntiata majora,* excluding from this category the problems controverted in the School by theologians and philosophers who possess real authority. The Reverend Father General does not contest the fact that the rigorous manner has its advantages and may be preferred by some. Redoes deny however the *obligation* of accepting it by reason of the principles that rule the theological and philosophical teaching of the Society of Jesus". X. Le Bachelet, *ibid.,* col. 1041.

II. JESUIT THEOLOGIANS IN THE XVIIth CENTURY.

A). Theology in general.

The most renowned of the masters of the Society of Jesus was Suarez who evolved a general theological system having many points of similarity to Thomism and Scotism. It will be discussed in the following chapter. The following are the other great XVIth century Jesuit theologians, three of whom were especially outstanding.

1. Francisco Toledo[1] (1532-1596) professor at the Roman College from 1552 to 1568 and later cardinal (1593) is "rightly considered to be the Father of Scholastic Theology in the Society of Jesus : in his own Order he played the part that Alexander of Hales and Albert the Great had played in theirs. His writings were not numerous, but his method, which combined with scholastic rigour the *positive element* drawn mainly from the Fathers, is noteworthy". Indeed remarks Le Bachelet, " the importance given to the positive and especially patristic element is truly a characteristic note (of the S. J.) even among the more strictly scholastic theologians... Several of these theologians owed their peculiarly expressive appellations to their positive erudition rather than to their dialectical ability"[2].

2. Pedro da Fonseca[3] (1528-1599) professor at Coimbra is chiefly known for his numerous philosophical treatises. In these he follows Scotus rather than St. Thomas. He it was who evolved the theory of *scientia media,* adopted by the Society and usually associated with Molina.

3. Luis de Molina[4] (1536-1600) born at Cuenca, joined the Society at Alcala, studied philosophy at Coimbra and then taught it there for four years. He studied theology at Evora and Coimbra, after which he was immediately set to teaching it, mainly at Evora, a new university, where he remained for nearly 20 years. His superiors then allowed him to give his time to writing his works. A little before 1600 he was call to Madrid to teach Moral theology, but died shortly afterwards. Molina's writings are the *Concordia* (1588), the *Commentaries* on the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa* (1592) and the *De justitia et jure* (6 volumes, published in 1593, 1596, 1600 and posthumously). But the work which gained him fame and at which, it is said, he

1 Hurter, *Nomenclator,* in, 247-256.
2 X. Le Bachelet, *op. cit.,* col., 1044-1045.
3 Hurter, *ibid.,* 148·. L. Mahieu, *Suarez,* p. 41-42.
4 Hurter, *ibid.,* 148-151. E. Vaxsteenbergiie, *Molina,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 2090-2092.

worked for thirty years, is the first. Its full title is *Concordia liberi arbitrii acni gratia donis, divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione, et reprobatione.* It consists of a collection of dissertations on a few articles of the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa;* especially *quæst.* ***XIV*** (I short dissertation on *art. 8* and 53 diss, on *art. 13 :* utrum scientia Dei sit futurorum contingentium), *q.* ***XIX*** (3 diss, on *art. 6 :* utrum voluntas Dei semper impleatur), *q.* ***XXII*** (de providentia), *q.* ***XXIII*** *(àt* prædestinatione). The work appeared in the same year (1588) that Bannez published his own commentary of the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa* containing the doctrine he had long been teaching at Salamanca.

4. Gregory of Valencia [2](1551-1603) although Spanish by birth, taught mainly at Dillingen and Ingoldstadt before coming to Rome at the time of the *De Auxiliis* controversies in which he defended Molinism. He died in 1603 worn out by his labours in the congregations and was first replaced by Fr. Arrubal (d. 1608) and then by Fr. í)e la Bastida'.

5. Gabriel Vasquez[3] (1551-1604) professor at Alcala and at Rome, partisan of a teaching of grace similar to Molina's, is also famous for his disagreements with Suarez[4,5] on doctrinal issuess. Their long controversy was finally forbidden by the General of the Order. Although an original thinker Vasquez seems to have been more rash than Suarez, says M. Mahieu[6]. Like Lessius he stands in the Society as a representative of the wider tendency.

6. Leonard Lessius[7] (1554-1623) Belgian Jesuit, a pupil of Suarez at Rome, professor of theology at the Louvain scolasticate (1585-1600) began his teaching by opposing Baius who caused 31 of his propositions to be censured by the University. At a later date, Pope Sixtus V was to declare these propositions "sound" *(sanee doctrina articuli).* In questions of grace Lessius was a frank Molitiist. In his *De gratia efficaci* (appendix *De prædestinatione et*

1 Hurter, *Nomenclator,* π, 401-404.

2 Who later left the Society and became chancellor of Valladolid University. Hurter, *ibid.,* 402. —3 Hurter, *ibid.,* 385-389.

4 Scheeben likens Vasquez' attitude to Suarez to that of Scotus towards St. Thomas : *ait S. Thomas, negat Scotus.*

5 In r593 Vasquez denounced 32 of Suarez' propositions to Rome. These concerned grace, merit, penance, predestination, and the person of Christ.

6 *F. Suarez,* p. 53. " Vasquez did not admit that there was in God any justice in the true sense of the word with regard to created beings. He regarded the very nature of good as the basis of moral obligation. Together with Lessius he regarded predestination and reprobation as consequent on the prevision of human acts, and grace as efficacious by reason of our voluntary co-operation L. Mahieu, *ibid.,* p. 52-53.

7 Hurter, *ibid.,* 619-631. I'. Bernard, *Lessius* or *Leys* in *Diet, thtol.,* col· 453-454·

reprobatione) i6io, he resumed the expression he had devised against Baius in 1586, *post prævisa merita*[1]. His teaching on the nature of efficacious grace, which he does not distinguish in *actu primo,* before the giving of consent, from sufficient grace, was contested by Bellarmine and Suarez, while in 1613 Fr. Aquaviva made obligatory the doctrine that teaches the relative superiority of efficacious grace considered even before its effect[2]. Apart from these subtle questions, however, Lessius composed works of great doctrinal value and it is these that have brought him fame. The best known deals with the divine perfections *(De perfectionibus divinis).* Lessius is rightly considered one of the foremost of the XVIIth century theologians. " Urban VIII had an equal admiration for his great virtue and his learning "[3].

7. Saint Robert Bellarmine[4] (1542-1621) born of an impoverished noble family near Florence, joined the Society in 1560 and studied philosophy before teaching literature from 1563 to 1567. He went on to study theology at Padua (1567-1569) and Louvain. He was ordained in the latter town in 1570 and at once began to teach theology and sacred oratory (1570-1576). In 1576 he was put in charge of a course of studies in the art of controversy, which had been inaugurated at that time in the Roman College, in order to prepare English and German students for their work in Protestant countries. The fruits *of* Bellarmine's twelve years of study in these matters are to be found in his *Disputationes de controversiis Christiana fidei adversus hujus temporis hæreticos* which is the principal work of this great theologian and controversialist. Bellarmine's other works, which are many[5], are mainly polemical[6]

1 See X. Le Bachelet, *Jésuites,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1031 sq.

3 See *ibid.,* 1032-1033. —3 ₱5 Bernard, *op. cit.*

4 Hurter, *op. cit.,* nr, 678-695. X. Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 560-599. J. de LA Servière, *La théologie de Bellarmin,* Paris, 1909. J· Thermes, *Le Bx R. Bellarmin,* (Coll. *Les Saints),* Paris, 1923. Pope Pius XI when declaring St. Robert Bellarmine a Doctor was pleased to enumerate all that earned for the saint such a noble title in the Church; his preaching, his catechism, ascetic writings, and especially his theological treatises and his famous *Controversies* with heretics as well as his unfaltering attachment to the Holy See. Bull *Pravidentissimus Deus* in *Acta Apost. Sedis,* 1931, 433-438.

5 Complete list in X. Le Bachelet, *op. cit.,* col. 577-587.

6 completing the Controversies and special polemical writings. (14

and exegetical [1], together with works of pastoral and moral instruction [2]. He continued to write even while occupying various charges in the Order (after 1588) and as cardinal, 1599. At the Roman court under Clemens VIII (except during the years of his disgrace 1602-1605 when he remained at his archiépiscopal see of Capua) and later under Paul V he possessed considerable influence, due to his theological learning, his unflagging and temperate zeal, and his holiness. He died in 1621, a few months after Paul V. He was beatified by Pius XI (1923), canonised in 1930 and declared a Doctor in 1931.

The Controversies[3], Bellarmine's outstanding work, claimed "to bring together in one general work all the particular studies that had previously been made concerning disputed points in matters of religion The work contains 15 general controversies divided into four series or volumes[4], dealing with the rules of faith, I; the Church, II; the sacraments, in; grace, iv. The first series on the *rules offaith* treats, in three controversies of: *a)* the word of God contained in the Scriptures and orally transmitted; *b)* Christ as Head of the Church; *c)* the sovereign pontiff as spiritual head and also temporal ruler. The second, on the *Church,* treats in 4 controversies of: *a)* the council or the Church spread throughout the world \ *b)* the members of the Church; and in this context the author writes of immunities, vows and civil power; *c)* purgatory; *d)* heaven. In the third, consisting of 5 controversies, he deals with the *sacraments* in general and in particular, and also of indulgences and the jubilee. Lastly, the fourth series, on *grace,* deals with *a)* the first man; *b)* the loss of grace; *c)* grace regained, freewill, justification and good works.

Ihis apologetical work is noteworthy both for the ground it covers and its method. It was meant for the Protestants, or rather as an arm for the future defenders of the faith against the Protestants. And indeed, " I he controversialist let pass nothing" that contemporary heterodoxy had advanced against the Person of Christ, His attributes, and His role as mediator, or against the Catholic Church, its head, members, customs, worship, sacraments, teaching on grace, justification, merit and good works. It is, in its way, a true *Summa"**. The synthesis itself is admirable and no less so the manner in which it was conceived and carried out. " I he *method* is simple but perfectly adapted to the author's purpose. He begins each question by comparing the errors of the heretics and the opinions of Catholic theologians and goes on to explain the teaching of the Church or the opinion

1 Especially a commentary on the Psalms.

5 His sermons at Louvain, two catechisms and a number of short ascetic treatises *(De ascensione mentis in Deum, De (eterna felicitate sanctorum, De ¿tmitu columine,* etc.). We may also mention the De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis which enjoyed a lasting popularity (Cf. vol. I, p. 15).

3 1st ed. in 3 vols, Ingoldstadt, 1586, 1588, 1593. 2nd ed., Venice, 1596 in 4 volumes. —4 In the Venice edition.

SX. Le Bachelet, *0/>. cit.,* col. 588-589.

to which he himself leans. Then follows a closely reasoned argument based on Holy Writ, conciliary or pontifical decisions, patristic witness, the practice of the Church and agreement of theologians. Speculation plays but a secondary part. In this Bellarmine was loyal to the principle that is attributed to him : Theology is primarily theology and not metaphysics. Each question ends with a concise answer to difficulties" '.

Bellarmine's theology[2], almost entirely contained in the *Controversies,* is essentially *positive:* necessarily, in order to refute the Protestants on their own ground, he mainly appeals to arguments of authority. He has little affection for the scholastic method, though, when need be, he defends it against the scoffing of the Calvinists. He himself has occasional recourse to rational arguments; but these are in the moral rather than the metaphysical plane. He is especially ingenious in showing the disastrous consequences of Protestant principles [3]. In reality, Bellarmine's theology "lacks originality"[4] and we need not give any outline here. We must, however, define his position *on the question of grace* which became such a bone of contention at Rome while he still lived.

Bellarmine rejected Bannez' physical predetermination [5] and also integral Molinism, such as that taught by Lessius. He considered that efficacious grace differs from sufficient grace in *actu primo,* before consent ; it is efficacious because it is *congruent* in circumstances foreseen to be favourable. Congruism seems best to correspond with his teaching[6]. Saint Robert Bellarmine is known to have inspired Aquaviva's decree which imposed this doctrine on the Order Similarly, as regards predestination he differs from Molina, although he endeavours to prove that Molina seeks the cause of predestination not " in the predestined, but solely in the pure and gratuitous will of God"[8]. To his mind not only efficacious grace is congruent, but God chooses it because it is congruent and He *wills* to save those to whom He gives it : the motive of His choice is His will that His choice should triumph [9]. Bellarmine's congruism, based on *scientia media* [10], must not be confused with Augustinian congruism as explained above.

B). Practical Moral Theology [11].

The Society of Jesus has effectively contributed to the growth of moral theology by means of general commentaries

1 *Ibid.,* col. 589.

- See the 700 pages devoted to this subject by Fr. J. de la Serviere, *op. at.*

3 *Ibid.,* p. 736"738· — 4 *Ibid.,* p. 727. — 5 *Ibid.,* p. 659-665.

6 As with that of Suarez. — 7 See above, p. 768. — 8 J. DE LA SERVIERE. *ibid,,* p. 601. 9 *Ibid,* — 10 Usually implied when not treated explicitly.

11 See J de Blic, S. J., *Jésuites, théologie morale,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1060-1092.

of the *Summa theologica* (lIMIæ) composed by its great theologians, Toledo, Valencia, Vasquez, Suarez, but still more perhaps by means of the methodical discussion of practical cases of conscience and the great number of treatises especially meant to facilitate their solution. "The originality of the Jesuits" is not "to have invented casuistry"[1], but to have stressed its importance and determined its laws, especially probabilism. The most outstanding among the Jesuist casuists of this period[2] are *Toledo, Juan Azor* (d. 1603), *H. Henriquez* (d. 1608) and especially *Th. Sanchez* (d. 1610) an "eminent moralist whose vast work possibly lays itself open to criticism here and there, but nevertheless remains asa whole a splendid monument of scientific moral teaching". These masters have given rise to a school both in the Society and without[3]. The very real abuses of later casuists are not to be attributed either to casuistry itself or to probabilism.

Probabilism[4] is a moral teaching that favours the use of probable opinions in doubtful cases of conscience[5]. It may have seemed an entirely new doctrine. There is no doubt that both St. Augustine and St. Thomas theoretically held the principle: *In dubio tutior fiars est tligenda*[6]. But since these authors did not see things from the same angle as the moderns they cannot be contrasted. The probabilist principle in favour of which the Renaissance Dominican masters[7] were rightly or wrongly invoked, rapidly made headway in the Society of Jesus, probably about the end of the XVIth century, and eventually, despite Jansenist opposition, throughout the whole Church. Today it is currently taught in the schools, though it has not replaced all the other Catholic systems, notably *aquiprobabilism,* which, like probabilism itself, may be traced back to St. Alphonsus.

III. MOLINISM[8].

Molinism is primarily a theological system dealing with the relations of divine and human activity; of necessity, therefore, it affects every branch of sacred learning. *Since* it was deliberately evolved as an offset to Protestantism it is particularly useful from an apologetical viewpoint. Similarly, it possesses great practical and pastoral advan-

[1] *Ibid..,* col. 1074. —[2] *Ibid.,* col. 1089.
[3] See E. DUBLANCHY, *Casuistique,* in *Did. théol.,* 1S72 *sq.*
[4] See J. DE Bl.lC, *Probabilisme,* in *Did. Af>ol.,* col. 301-340.
[5] For the strict and extremely precise conditions which make this use legitimate, see A. Vermeersch, *ibid.,* col. 340-361.
[6] Cf. J. de Blic, *ibid.,* col. 303-312.
[7] See p. 76S. This historical detail is far from being settled.
[8] Bibliography, p. 753.

tages, well calculated to reassure those timorous souls who fear God's justice more than they trust in His goodness. It is also singularly adapted to a predominantly ascetic spirituality[1]. Yet if considered in its specific elementsit is found to touch immediately on only two points: on the one hand the knowledge of God and predestination, termed *post prævisa inerita;* on the other hand, the efficacy of grace, attributed to human consent and therefore qualified as efficacy *ab extrínseco.* In this, Molinism differs from the Augustinian systems. Several defenders of the system are of course nothing loth to allege St. Augustine or St. Thomas in their favour; but Molina himself declares that he disagrees with them [2] as regards the finer points of the question, while one of the modern interpreters of the system, though naturally inclined to place it under St. Thomas' mantle, declares that he has no intention "of finding the Molinist system in St. Thomas"; he asks us, however, to give Molina the merit " of giving substance to ideas that were in the atmosphere of Thomist tradition " [3].

I. The basis of all this new system is a certain human conception of free-will. The existence of free-will is admitted as indisputable and it is conceived as excluding all influences, even divine, that would infallibly determine the will, by their intrinsic quality, to choose one object rather than another. Molinism " makes the essence of free-will consist precisely in the fact that the created will, predetermined as regards its desire for universal good, *determines itself* as regards the choice of particular good " [4]. It is essentially characterised by its *rejection of any predetermination* that might be " accepted by the will before it determines itself "[5]. And thus, those passages in which St. Thomas excludes from free volition, physical determination *adunum* which is proper to beings that are not free, are made to apply to all determination, to such a point that the will cannot be determined even by God Himself [3]. This basic concept of free-will rules the remainder of the theological

[1] See below, p. 794.

[2] Molina most ingenuously considers that if his attempt at conciliation had been known in early times there would never have been any Pelagianism and that Protestantism in our times and Semipelagianism would have been untenable. See *De Concordia,* q. 23, a. 4-5 ; disp. V and memb. I ; p. 548.

[3] A. n'Al.fes, *Providence,* in *Did. Ap.,* col. 447.

[4] *Ibid.,* col. 452. — [5] *Ibid.,* col. 451.

system which was deliberately elaborated in order to adapt it to dogma and to exclude the Pelagian or Semipelagian errors that might have discredited it. Both divine operation and predestination are involved in the workings of this clever mechanism.

Divine motion may be either natural or supernatural, *a)* Even in the natural order there is no physical premotion : the influence of God is ^*co-operation* which affects not the operative *faculty* but the operation itself at the same time as it is produced'; again, God is not the whole cause of the effect produced; causality is shared by God and the creature'. On each of these points Molina purposely widens the distance between himself and St. Thomas[3]; *b)* In the *supernatural order,* divine influence or grace is no longer regarded as a supernatural impulse received in the faculties, but as an auxiliary directly received in the vital acts, especially the *indeliberate movements* of the intellect and will which pave the way to the free determination of the supernatural act and make it possible[4], *c)* Essentially *one and the same grace* prepares the soul to produce it and helps to elicit it: it is first sufficient and then becomes efficacious — *ab extrínseco* — through the consent of the will[5]. Prevenient or exciting or operating grace becomes subsequent, helping or co-operating, without any intrinsic modification.

Predestination in its turn is made to depend on the human will, at least through the intermediary of God's knowledge. Molina of course maintains the gratuity of total predestination, but he fashions an instrument destined to study predestination to glory from a new angle. "His originality lies in his introduction of the idea of this operative knowledge, which he terms *scientia media"*[6], to the ramifications of the

' Molina, *De concordia,* q. 14, a. 13, disp. xxvi, p. 152-158.

-*Ibid.,* p. 158. Here we find the well known simile : "Cum duo trahunt navim, totus motus proficiscitur ab unoquoque trahentium, sed non tanquam a tota causa motus, siquidem quivis eorum simul efficit cum altero omnes ac singulas partes ejusdem motus". Cf. *ibid.,* disp. xxx, p. 178.

3 At the outset of this dissertation Molina recalls that for St. Thomas, God maintains the power of secondary causes and *applies* them to their operation " non secus atque artifex securim applicat ad scindendum the secondary cause acts only inasmuch as "it is first moved by God, *prius eo mota"* : Molina substitutes his idea of co-operation for this *physical premotion.* (Bellarmine remained loyal to premotion and in our time is followed by many authors kindly disposed to Molina, such as Billot). The sharing of causality is also contrary to St. Thomas who ascribes all to God and all to the creature, the latter being subordinated to God. *Contra Gentes,* bk. ill, c. 67, 70.

4 *Concordia,* q. 14, a. 13, disp. 45, p. 256. Actual grace is thus not a physical and transitory entity, making the act supernatural by a physical agency in the absence of the *infused habitus.* Suarez follows Molina closely. Bellarmine differs from both and follows St. Thomas.

5 Molina distinguishes efficacy in *actu primo* and in *actu secundo* and denies that the natural will adds any intrinsic quality to grace. *Concordia,* q. 23, p. 4-5, disp. I, memb. 6; p. 462. Bellarmine rejected the efficacy of grace *ab extrínseco* as "absolutely opposed to St. Augustine's way of thinking"; cf. J. de la Servare, *Bellarmin,* p. 578-580.

6 A. d'Alès, *Pridest.,* in *Diet. Apoi.,* col. 240.

traditional conception. Though not going as far as to identify the lot of the elect and the damned as Vazquez did', he so stressed the part of intelligence, that Suarez wisely tempered his teaching and gave greater importance to the will2, thus approaching the views held by Bannez in this delicate question.

2. The Molinist theory of predestination is essentially intellectualist since it is based on scientia media and stands or falls by the validity of this foundation.

To Molina's mind *scientia media* is an intermediary between *natural* divine knowledge by which God knows all things that fall within His power3, and His *free* knowledge, i. e., that which ensues on the free act by which he calls possible beings into existence 4. These two knowledges are very like the knowledge of simple intelligence (concerning possible being) and the knowledge of vision (concerning past, present, and future reality) of which Thomists speak, and it is between these two that is found *scientia media* whose object is the *fnturibilia* or future conditional acts5. These latter are given their place in the various plans of Providence by the knowledge of God previous to any act of His will and come closer to reality than *tht possibilia;* they point to a conditioned and contingent existence6.

The better to understand the practical complexion of this knowledge it would be well to specify the generality of objects attributed to it by Molina. In reality they are all the possible determinations of the will in *every conceivable circumstance of Providence* in which the creature may find himself; for all the *possibilia* that are separately conceived by the simple intelligence, run together so as to form infinite series of possibilities7 accordingly as freewill may choose one or the other. God, infinitely knowing, conceives all possible choices and sees them so distinctly that each order of Providence constitutes in itself a complete whole, "and possesses its own individuality in the ideal order"8. The divine will, guided by *scientia media,* finally chooses an order of events, which, by means of a free decree passes from the ideal into actuality; with the execution of this decree is concerned the knowledge of vision.

1 *In Sum. theol.,* Ia, q. 23, disp. 89. Lessius' teaching is very similar.

3 See below, p. 787.

3 Per quam omnia ea cognovit ad quæ divina potentia sive immediate sive interventu causarum secundarum sese extendit. *Concordia,* q. 14, a. 13, disp. 52, p· 317. I

4 Qua Deus, post liberum actum suæ voluntatis, absque hypothesi et conditione aliqua cognovit absolute et determinate, ex complexionibus omnibus contingentibus, quænam reipsa essent futur», quæ non item. *Ibid.*

5 Qua ex altissima et inscrutabili comprehensione cujusque liberi arbitrii, in sua essentia intuitus est quid, pro sua innata libertate, si hoc vel illo vel etiam infinitis rerum ordinibus collocaretur, acturum esset, cum tamen posset, si vellet, facere reipsa oppositum. *Ibid.*

6 They are thus neither real nor purely possible.

' See the definition given n. 6. Cf. A. d'Alès explanations in *Autour de Molina,* in *Rech. sc. relig.,* 1917, p. 462 sq. ' 'T,

° A. d'Ai-Ès, *Providence,* in *Diet. Apol.,* col. 448. See *ibid.,* col. 447-459. According to this author, therefore, there exists in the divine knowledge prior to the decree, not physical but ideal predeterminations. I

This knowledge of future conditional acts is extremely mysterious, and innumerable attempts have been made to explain it. Even the Molinists do not agree on the interpretation of the master's ideas. Some insist above all on those passages in the *De Concordia* in which the *scientia media* is based on a supercomprehension of free will, either considered in itself or in the circumstances that can affect its operation, in such a way that God infallibly knows its future determinations. Others, with more likelihood, consider that Molina judged the *scientia media* to be based on God's infinite comprehension of His essence regarded as the universal exemplar; even though he terms it *comprehensio liberi arbitrii,* it is no wise in God "an operation in some sort passive" but rather "that active power by which God conceives future conditional acts and arranges them in diverse orders of Providence; a power which is, as it were, creative, by which the divine mind projects intelligible worlds within itself"[1]. Since these theories, despite their variations, do little to dispel the mystery of *scientia media,* especially as regards its specific difference from the knowledge of simple intelligence[2], other Molinists simply confess their inability to explain it[3]; some indeed, finding the theory of Molinist supercomprehension quite contradictory, but nevertheless convinced of the principle of *scientia media,* attempt to evolve a new explanation[4].

3. The theory we have just outlined has its application in the theology of predestination and grace. 1. In the *ideal order* that God has decided to realise, are found the elect who accede freely to grace, and will come to glory; there are also sinners who will continue in evil, and will be damned. God knows them by means of His *scientia media;* thus the predestination of the elect is *post prcevisa merita*[5], just as the oss of the wicked is consequent upon their sins. Freedom is absolutely safeguarded: since God chooses such and such a determined order of Providence, the lot of both classes of souls is, of course, also determined, but only in the ideal order: in the actual order each one is self determined. 2. Similarly God knows by means of *scientia media* the graces that each requires according to any particular providential order; but he so measures them that the will may determine itself[6]. Whatever the ideal order, known by

1 A. d'Alès, *Autour de Molina, op. cit.,* p. 476. "As we have already said, each creation of *scientia media* — for each of the worlds evoked by it is a creation of the ideal order — involves an exact determinism, but a divine determinism which is the measure of things and is not measured by them *Ibid.*

3 See M. De La Taille, S. J., *Sur diverses classifications de la science divine,* in *Rech. sc. rei.,* 1923, p. 7-23,* 529-542. — 3 L. Billot, *De Deo Uno et Trino,* vol. I, th. 22, p. 207 sq. — 4 See *Nouv. Rev. théol.,* 1929, p. 132-135.

5 Lessius' terminology (See above). According to Molina this prevision depends on *scientia media* inasmuch as it deals with merits *conditionate futura.*

6 See A. d'Alès, *Providence,* in *Diet. Apol.,* col. 459-472 (supernatural divine motion): a subtle explanation in which motion is invariably opposed to determination.

scientia media, grace is rendered efficacious only through the consent of the will. In this ideal order, the will determines itself : in the Molinist conception, freedom is the property by which the creature determines itself *to the exclusion of God*[1]. *Scientia media* perceives this purely ideal determination, which, in the order of actuality, even when combined with the divine motion, remains what it was, the sole possession of the will. In order to retain this conception without lapsing into Pelagianism, the Molinist theologians have patiently evolved the system whose main outlines we have endeavoured to sketch in.

4. The Church did not permit the teaching of Molinism until the matter had been threshed out at length[2]. In the XVIth century this theological system was too new and in some way too bold for those theologians who stood for the Augustinian and Thomist tradition in the teaching on grace. The most vigilant of all was Bannez who tirelessly extirpated all doctrinal innovations both within and without his Order. In 1589 he denounced Molina's work in the 3rd edition (Antwerp 1595). Under Pope Clement VIII (1592-1605) who was considered to have little love for the Jesuits, the opposition stiffened,first at Valladolid by means of a campaign of preaching by a Dominican, 1593, and then by means of public defence of the contrary theses by the Dominicans and Jesuits in the following year. When Rome reserved to itself the judging of the affair in 1594, Molina vainly attacked Bannez' teaching. The latter, however, was successful in persuading the authorities to consider (1596) Molina's book alone.

The controversies termed "De auxiliis" did not open in Rome until 1598 and lasted until 1607. The Congregations in which the teachings denounced as doubtful were studied, were first presided by cardinals from 1598 until 1602. After this date the popes themselves decided to direct the debates in person. These papal congregations, to the number of 85[3], are particularly important. Under *Clemens VIII* the Molinist teaching as a whole was the main object of study, concerning the natural power of free-will, *scientia media,* predestination and the right use of divine aid. Molina's doctrine was invariably compared with that of St. Augustine " which the pope had made, as it were, the

[1] A. d'Ales, in *Rech. sc. ret.,* 1917, p. 9. Cf. *Did. A/>., toc. cit.,* col. 454, where this teaching is ascribed to St. Thomas.

[2] See E. Vansteenberghe, *Molinisme, op. cit.,* col. 2154-2166.

[3] 68 under Clemens VIII from 1602 until 1605, and 17 under Paul V in 160 and 1606. J

touchstone of orthodoxy". In general, opinion was unfavourable to Molina. No condemnation however was made by Clement VIII who died in 1605 [1]. At the end of the same year, *Paul V,* wishing to make an end, caused the work to be resumed under the same conditions as required by his predecessor and also authorised an examination of the theory *of* physical predetermination, which had long been denounced by the Molinists ; the censors, however, were mainly in favour of the Dominican teaching. After six months of discussion the pope put an end to the sessions, asked the members of the Congregation to give him their opinion in writing and reserved the right to give a final judgment when he saw fit'. The commission maintained its censures (against 42 propositions of Molina). On August 28, 1607, the feast of St. Augustine, Paul V consulted the cardinals who were present for the last time; their opinions were very much at variance. The pope therefore concluded that the two schools were agreed on the dogma and at variance only as regarded its explanation. There was therefore no immediate need for the intervention *of* the Holy Sec [2] Thus ended the famous *De auxiliis* controversies. It meant the triumph of liberty in the choice of a theological system in these grave matters. Since that time it has been maintained by the Church and confirmed by a decree of Benedict XIV, dated July 13, 1748.

The wisdom of this solution is evident. The agreement of divine omnipotence and human liberty is an impenetrable mystery. That fact that two systems, emphasising one and the other aspect of the mysterious problem, exist side by side, has much to recommend it. It seemed especially opportune to affirm human liberty in the face of Calvinism, while on the other hand timorous souls, dismayed by the unqualified vision of the rights of God will aways find relief in an apparently less rigorous system. The length of the discussions, moreover, had shewn how seriously the new teaching had been examined. The controversies had yet another advantage. Fr. Aquaviva, while defending Molina, did not impose his teaching on the Society. Rather did he present as the official teaching on grace the *congruismi of* Suarez (1610, 1613) which makes important concessions to the Augustinian theses. Bellarmine's congruism differs little from that of Suarez [4].

[1] Probably due to the intervention of Cardinal du Perron.

[2] See E. Vansteenberghe, *op. cit.,* col. 2:61-2162.

[3] It is known that when St. Francis of Sales was consulted he counselled that liberty of choice should be allowed, and his opinion, added to Du Perron swayed the pope's judgment.

[4] See above, p. 770 and 786.

CHAPTER VI.

Francis Suarez (1548-1617).

Special Bibliography.

Editions: Two complete editions: "Venice (Coleti), 23 vol.. 1740-1751 ; Paris (Vivès), 26 vols., 1856-1866'.

Studies: Hurter, *Nomenclator,* in, 376-385. R. de Scoraille, S. J., *Fr. Suarez, DEtudiant, le Maitre, le Docteur, le Religieux,* 2 vols., Paris, 19u. L. Mahieu, *Fr. Suarez, Sa philosophie, et les rapports qu'elle a avec la théologie,* Paris, 1921. E. Hocedez, S. J., *Suarez d'après un thomiste* (on the work of M. Mahieu, recognised as an "impartial but severe judge"), in *Nouv. rev. théol.,* 1922 (vol. 49), p. 85-97. P. DESCOQS, criticism of the same book, *Archives de phil,* vol. II, fascicule il, p. 123-154. L. Mahieu, reply to Fr. Descoqs, *Rev. thorn.,* 1925 (vol. 30), p. 250-285 *(D¿electidsme suarézien).* Special questions : A. VACANT, *Angelologie,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1228-1248. H. Quilliet, *Congruisme, ibid.,* col. 1120-1148. X. Le Bachelet, *Jésuites, ibid.,* col. 1012 sq. See also C. Werner, *Franz Suarez u. die Scholastik der letzen lahrhundente,* Ratisbon, 1861. Brief recent study, E. CONZE, *Der Begriff der metaphysik bei F. Suarez,* Leipsic, 1928 (Cf. *Bull, thorn.,* 1929, p. 523-528).

I. LIFE AND WORKS OF SUAREZ.

The most illustrious theologian of the Society of Jesus, he who " sums up all Scholasticism " or rather, according to Bossuet, "the majority of the Moderns "3, Francis Suarez, passed the greater part of his life teaching theology; more than 40 years all told, of which the last 20 were spent at the University of *Coimbra* of which he was the outstanding

1 Suarez himself published only half his work. The remainder was published for the first time between 1619 and 1655 at Coimbra and at Lyons.

- In this edition, almost identical with the foregoing, the works of Suarez, are thus distributed (date of the 1st ed.) : A. vol. 1. *De Deo uno cl trino* (1606); vol. 2. *De angelis* (1620); *De anima* (1621). — B. vol. 4. *De fine ultimo, actibus et peccatis* (1628) ; vol. 5-6 : *De legibus* (1612); vol. 7-io : *De gratia* (1619, 1651, 1655); voi. il: *theological opuscula* (1st series, 1599; 2nd series 1S59); vol. 12: *De virtutibus theologicis* (1621); vol. 13-16 : *De religione (De virtute religionis,* 1608-1609; *De statu religioso et de Societate ¿esu* (1624-1625). — C. vol. 17-18: *De Incarnatione* (1590); vol. 19: *De vila Christi (1592}* ; vol. 20-21 : *De sacramentis, Baptismo, Confirm., Euch.* (1595); vol. 22: *De Ponit., Extr. Unet.* (1602). — D. vol. 23 and 23bis : *De Censuris* (1603); vol. 24 : *Defensio fidet* (16(3); vol. 25 : *Disputationes metaphysiae* (1597).

A. B. C. indicate the corresponding parts of the *Summa theologica.*

Pt ¿face sur I instruction pastorale du 15 sept, tóqtf·

glory. Born at Granada (1548) he entered the Society in 1564 and studied at Salamanca where he learned philosophy from a Jesuit, but his theology from the Dominicans in the same town. He was a slow starter, but soon made extraordinary progress in *philosophy,* so that when he had completed his studies in 1571 he was made a professor at Segovia and soon afterwards in 1574 was entrusted with a course of *theology.* He first taught at Valladolid (1574-1580), then at Rome (1580-1585) at the Roman College where Lessius was his pupil, at Alcala (1585-1593) and lastly, after another interval at Salamanca (1593-1597) at *Coimbra,* where his superiors had sent him at the formal instance of Philip II (Dec. 1596). He occupied the first Chair of Theology until his death in 1617, though after 1615 he no longer taught but became *jubilarían* professor.

The writings of Suarez form one of the most notable contributions to Christian literature. They are almost entirely theological. In the complete editions [1] they are arranged in the same order as St. Thomas's *Summa theologica,* though this does not correspond to the order of the publication or composition of these writings. This arrangement allows comparison between the work of the disciple and the master and the former is seen to have treated nearly the whole of theology. Though some questions do not appear under a specific title *(De vera religione, de Ecclesia, de justitia et jure)* they are often explained elsewhere. We may regret that no place was found for an Introduction to Theology, and treatises on Holy Orders, Matrimony, and the Last Things.

Suarez published his first treatises on the Incarnation (1590) and the Life of Christ (1592) at *Alcala.* Father Aquaviva who wanted the Society to have its own commentary of St. Thomas, urged Suarez to write up his notes in the form of a book, at the same time counselling great discretion so as not to raise any Dominican opposition [a]. The obstacles however did not come from without, but from within the Society. *G, Vasques,* one time professor of theology at Alcala, who had exchanged functions with Suarez in 1585 when the latter had left Rome on account of his health, returned to Alcala in 1591 and pointedly criticised his successor's teaching. For the sake of peace, Suarez went to Salamanca in 1593 where he continued to teach and compose his works. The doctrinal differences of the two professors touched on

[1] See above, p. 577. These editions are not faultless from a critical viewpoint. See R. DE Scorraille, *op. cit.,* II, p. 403-405.

[a] Cf. L. Mahieu, *op. cit.,* p. 52.

several matters. In 1599 their controversy on the subject of the justice of God became public : Vasquez denied that in God there was justice in the true sense of the word with reference to created beings. Aquaviva was forced to intervene and counselled charity to both disputants '.

While at Salamanca Suarez published his first treatise on the *Sacraments* (1595) and his great philosophical work *Disputationes metaphysics* (1597) which greatly enhanced his reputation He was still at Salamanca when the great controversies on grace where held, 1593-1594- He naturally took the part of the Jesuits, but with great moderation. He never played more than an indirect part in the debate. Nevertheless, in 1599, in order to ward off what seemed to be an imminent condemnation of Molina and the Society he published his *Opuscula theologica* in which "he endeavoured to shew that *scientia media* and a certain conception of divine co-operation and of grace did not deserve the charge of Pelagianism "[2]* His main contribution however was the completion of his own *congruist system,* which preserved the essentials of Molinism with the addition of certain theses apparently borrowed from Bannez, which served as a sop to " conciliatory " minds, but only excited still more the headstrong Dominican. In 1604 while on a visit to Rome, Suarez intervened more directly by various writings composed for the use of Father de la Bastida (especially the " *De vera intelligentiu auxilii efficacis",* published in 1655) and also perhaps by private conversations with Clemens VIII. When *Lessius,* in 1610, published his little treatise " *De gratia efficaci"* which set out the purest Molinism and also added the expression *predestinado post previsa merita,* not found in the *De Concordia**, Suarez, together with Bellarmine, attacked him, and Fr. Aquaviva by a decree dated December 14, 1613 imposed Suarez' teaching on grace upon the Society[5].

At this time Suarez enjoyed an unrivalled authority on every hand. Bannez and Vasquez had died in 1604. Furthermore, the difficulties he had once encountered at Salamanca, before 1580 and even during his second stay (1593-1597) at the hands of the Fathers of the Society who disliked his innovations, had almost disappeared. The *7/oly Office,* it is true, had condemned, in 1603, his teaching on the validity of confession (not absolution) at a distance, as found in his treatise on *Penance* (1602) and had maintained this sentence despite the author's personal recourse to Rome (1604), but this was but a minor and special point[6]. Paul V sent him a laudatory brief (Oct. 2, 1607) calling him *doctor eximius ac pins.* This was occasioned by a written dissert-

1 R. de Scoraille, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 305, sq.

2 In the work (z vols.), Suarez condensed the philosophical principles on which he based his theological synthesis.

3 L. Mahieu, *op. cit.,* p. 59. — ‹ See above, p. 767.

5 His treatises on this matter form the later edition.

6 See L. Mahieu, *op. cit.,* p. 61-64.

ation on the rights of the Holy See, rights he had already defended in his work *De censuris* (1603). His great treatises *De Deo* (1606), *De religione* (1608-1609), *De legibus* (1612) added still further to his reputation. In 1613 at the request of the nuncio he crossed swords with James I of England in his famous *Defensio fidei* dealing with the relations *of* Church and State I. But this work, and particularly its teaching on the lawfulness of tyrannicide, gave rise to much feeling against the Society in England and France. The suffering consequent on these difficulties completed the purification of the soul of this courageous religious who had devoted his life to the quest and the defence of truth. He had sought it with his heart no less than with his mind and thus admirably deserved the title of DOCTOR Pius 2 given him by the pope.

IL THE PHILOSOPHY OF SUAREZ. HIS INFLUENCE.

" Suarez had a profound influence on Catholic thought. Having become by means of his calm and rigorous method, the temperate nature of many of his solutions, and also the clarity and elegance of his style, *the outstanding doctor of the Society offesus,* he saw his own reputation enhanced by that of his eminent Order which was spending itself in such magnificent services in the struggle against heresy, the spreading and the defence of the Christian faith " 3. Suarez' work is mainly *theological** but he is best characterised by his *philosophy.* 1 he latter follows a middle way between St. Ihomas on the one hand and Scotus and Ockham on the other 4. these two latter, despite many divergences had many points of contact; they agreed remarkably well in rejecting St. I homas's authority. Suarez exploited their mutual criticisms. He carefully and methodically underlined their arguments, added his own remarks and thus built up a new and coherent system which is not lacking in unity and greatness to the eye of the sympathetic reader. The powerful originality of this work is best perceived by a careful observation of the points on which Suarez differs

l *Ibid.,* p. 70-72.

' Suarez himself counselled this combination of truth and piety: " Est enim sine veritate pietas imbecilla, et sine pietate veritas sterilis et jejuna ". *De tnysl. vita Christi.* Procem. Cf. R. de Scokaille, *0/>. cit.,* ir, p. 465-470.

' L. Mahieu, *0/>. cit.,* p. xv. — ‹ *Ibid.,* p. 496.498.

troni St. I homas in his philosophy. By pointing them out we have no intention of condemning the doctor of Coimbra, but rather to mark his vigorous personality r.

1. Probably the most personal feature of Suarez' philosophy is what M. Mahieu terms modalism. The idea of *modalities* not original; Suarez borrowed it from Cajetan but transformed it. It gives to his metaphysics a true unity2,3 although his is a new metaphysics differing from that of St. Thomas.

The concept of modality was adopted in order to preserve the *unity of beings,* which had been compromised by the Suarezian idea of distinction. The latter term is synonymous with *separability**. Separation is the criterion of distinction, since the ideas of *actuality* (perfection) and *potentiality* (imperfection) do not satisfy imaginative minds. For these, therefore, Suarez blends the physical with the metaphysical order. But it immediately ensues that the elements of the compound become disassociated; they lie side by side instead of fusing together. Unity is re-established by means of a modality which, without adding a fresh entity to things, is the principle of all the essential modifications (substantial modality) or accidenta modifications (accidental modality) to which the substance in question is subjected. In the forefront of these modifications we must mention the *union* of the various elements of compounded beings. Thus the union of matter and form, substance and accidents, soul and body, etc... is the work of a modality. Suarez multiplies these modalities beyond all bounds. Fashioning himself upon Scotus he establishes between the real and logical distinctions of the Thomists another intermediary distinction which is not the formal distinction of the Scotists, but a *modal distinction:* it is this that "exists between a thing and its mode of being".

2. In addition to this metaphysical modalism there remain many fundamental ontological questions in which he differs from St. Thomas, *a)* Since he could not easily accommodate his modality to the finite actuated essence and the existence that actuates it, he denied both their real and modal distinction 4. The identity of essence and existence thus ceases to be God's fundamental attribute and He is brought down nearer to the level of created things.

1 M. Mahieu writes: "Although his theological work purports to be a commentary of St. Thomas' *Summa* and generally follows the same order, it is easy to see that it admits but rarely its conclusions". *Op. cit.,* p. 499. The author means rarely as regards the fundamental points of philosophy, for he also mentions a number oi points of agreement between St. Thomas and Suarez (See the list in bis art. *Eclecticisms suarézien,* p. 27S-280), but he regards these agreements as "too rare and not very important" *(ibid.,* p. 2S1).

3 L. Mahieu, *op. cit.,* p. xiv.

3 *¡bid,,* p. 136 sq., 183 sq. — ‹ *Ibid.,* p. 164 sq.

b) God is still more diminished by his doctrine of the *analogy* of concepts. Although he does not admit with Ockham, any univicacy between the concept of being in God and in the creature, he found the Thomist analogy of *proportionality* insufficient : he desired an analogy *of proportion* to which he gave the name of analogy "of intrinsic attribution " '.

c) Furthermore, Suarez also profoundly modifies the fundamental teaching of Thomist philosophy, i. e., actuality and potentiality. This was the outcome of his original idea of potentiality. He was unable to conceive the idea of a pure potentiality, since potentiality does not exist in separation.

d) It follows, that for him "materia prima, primary matter, truly and of itself possesses a certain entitative actuality which places it in existence and allows God to make it exist independently of form " . If matter already possesses of itself a certain actuality, a certain entitative act, the role of tbe *form* is thereby diminished[3], a fact which should have led Suarez to admit several in order to bolster up the intensity by the number : he nevertheless maintains the Thomist thesis of the unity of form ; but with little conviction and merely as a probable doctrine[4].

3. Suarez' theories of substance and accident are also highly personal [5]. Their distinction is heavily underlined. *a)* lhe *accident* regarded as so imperfect by St. Thomas, since he saw it hardly as a being but rather as the being of a being *(ens entis),* becomes for Suarez a true being, having a real analogy of proportion with substantial being and not merely an analogy of proportionality. *Substance,* also, is enriched and, in bodies, possesses of itself in addition to *essential parts,* also *integral parts* that it does receive from *quantity.* lhe latter, therefore, plays but a minor and secondary part : adapting the parts of the substance to its own, extending them, developing them and making them coextensive with itself. Quantity becomes almost super-erogatory and its real existence is shewn with the utmost difficulty[6],

b) These data lead up to a very special explanation of the Eucharist, since Suarez has also his own way of conceiving the idea of place : [7] localisation is not a purely extrinsic determination of origin resulting from the enveloping surface : it is an *active* envelopment of the contained by the container; it penetrates the substance as such, apart from quantity which also has its own *(circumscriptive)* localisation, justas spiritual substance has its own *(definitive)* localisation. Multi-location (even circumscriptive) is possible, and St. Thomas errs in stating it to be contradictory.

« *Ibid.,* p. 8S-91. See above, p. 583. — 3 *Ibid.,* p. 50r. Cf. *ibid.,* p. 278-283.
3 *Ibid.,* p. 501. — 4 *Ibid.,* p. 287 sq. — 5 *Ibid.,* p. 248 sq., 291 sq., 503 sq.
6 L. Mahieu, *ofi cit·,* P- 306-307. —7 *Ibid.,* p. 386-404.

¿J Suarez' theory of relation is also noteworthy *, since it leads him to state that it is possible that the principle of contradiction is not applicable to the divine mysteries. Instead of distinguishing in the relation the *esse in* (general character of accidents) from the *esse ad* (special chatacter of relations), and recognising that though the former, inherent to the substance, represents the material aspect of the relation, it is the latter alone, *esse ad,* its formal aspect, which specifies it, Suarez identifies the *esse aa* and the *esse in:* the *esse ad,* an accident of very tenuous reality for the Thomists, either has none at all for him, or else too much, since Suarez, faced with the mystery of the Trinity, is forced to attribute its own perfection to the relation.

d) Yet another thesis pertains to general metaphysics and is applied to the theology of the Trinity and the Incarnation and was purposely evolved by Suarez in view of the Incarnation : it deals with subsistence or *personality*1. To his mind it consists in a *substantial modality,* but unlike Cajetan who places it between essence and existence, Suarez *adds* it to the essence previously actuated by existence, for the latter, in his philosophy, are one and the same. Yet may it not be objected that a modality added after the substantial being has already been constituted is but purely accidental? The unity of the human compound, particularly in Christ, is deeply sapped by this theory, despite the manifold subsistences that Suarez establishes (in the soul, the body, the whole compound, the integral parts, etc.). Vasquez' ridicule of this multiplication of modalities was not groundless.

Other divergences between Suarez and St. Thomas may be found in psychology; but they belong more particularly to the domain of philosophy 3. They are of use in shewing the personal quality of Suarez' thought, even in these highly important matters and the reader will not be surprised to find that the teaching that is now embodied in the 24 Thomist theses 4, is often contradicted by the opinions of Suarez.

III. NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL THEOLOGY.

The influence he wielded, no less than the vastness of his work, have undoubtedly made of Suarez the foremost theologian of modern times. His authority has made itself

1 *Ibid.,* p. 354-357- — 2 *ibid.,* p. 249-264, especially p. 257 sq.

3 Metaphysics and psychology are applied in the doctrine of angels, and in this matter Suarez built up his own system. — ♦See above, p. 579.

felt in every domain of theology whether dogmatic, moral or ascetic. His eclecticism contributed greatly to his success, though much is due to the outstanding quality and opportuneness of his work. At a time when theologians were busily engaged in throwing the traditional doctrine into relief for the confusion of heretics, the vast learning of Suarez necessarily left its mark. Before any explanation of his own theories, he faithfully summarises all those that had previously been evolved and Fr. Le Bachelet [1] supposes that it is precisely "this extensive knowledge and critical penetration of opinions maintained through the centuries that has caused it to be said of Suarez that *he speaks for all Scholasticism* Nor did this wealth of erudition detract from the acuity of his intellect, and though the philosophy he used occasionally strays from the pure ways of Thomism, it cannot be gainsaid that it was a powerful weapon in his skilful hands. His ingenious suggestions on many points opened up new avenues to theological speculation and he was careful to imitate St. Thomas even when he formulated fresh opinions : "Wherever the field was left free for opinion, I have sought to imitate the example and the wisdom of the same doctor, always preferring what seemed to me more in keeping with piety, reason, and tradition and leaving aside all else"[3] We shall do no more than mention the more outstanding of Suarez' doctrinal initiatives, since it may be taken for granted that as regards most other matters his theology faithfully echoes that of the Angelic Doctor.

A). God.

I. Existence. — Suarez did not preserve the radical unity of the five Thomist ways which may be summed up in the principle : the greater cannot be produced by the less or the superior alone contains the reason of the inferior. He entirely omits the 4th way (degrees of being) and controverts the first, which reaches God through movement, since he robs it of all metaphysical meanings. His proof of God's existence advances in two stages : *a)* he first proves the existence of uncreated being by the argument of efficient causes (2nd Thomist way [2]); *b)* he then establishes

[1] *Op. cit.*, col. 1045.
[3] *De incarnatione Verbi*, pref. Cf. R. DE ScORAILLE, *op. at.*, n, p. 456.
[2] L. Mahieu, *op. cit.*, p. 189192. — [4] *tbid.*, p. 192-194.

the oneness of this being by two arguments, one empirical, drawn from the beauty of this world and the order it displays x, the other metaphysical which is " in reality, no more than an analysis of the idea of necessity" (analysis already made by St. Thomas whose arguments, however, are criticised by Suarez)[1]. This unique uncreated being is God.

2. Suarez classifies the divine ATTRIBUTES under three heads. " The *first* are in a certain manner identical with the divine being and constitute its essence [3]. The *second* derive from the contemplation of created beings, especially by way of negation and elimination : immensity, immutability, invisibility, incomprehensibility. The third ascribe to God positive perfections which belong to created things"[4]; they establish between God and His creation " a likeness which is, however, purely analogical "[5]. We have already shewn that Suarez draws God sensibly nearer to created being in his philosophical thesis concerning the identity of essence and existence in the creature, and in that of the analogy of intrinsic attribution which he admits as existing between God and His work[6].* He offsets this by loosening the bond that binds Him to the operation of free creatures by teaching simultaneous *co-operation* alone; this is not motion in the true sense of the word (at least in the natural order) [7].

3. Trinity. — Suarez, not unlike Cajetan, admits in God an absolute subsistence, that of the nature, and three relative subsistences, those of the persons[8]. (St. Thomas says rather three subsisting beings). The divine relations are distinguishable from the essence only by reason, for the essence eminently includes their perfection, which, in any case, is *sui generis,* for the relations do not form part of the divine essence, ■of God inasmuch as He is God[9].

B). Grace and the Sacraments.

I. Grace. — One of Suarez' great theological glories is that of having created, within the framework of Molinism, a new theory of grace, more supple than Molina's. This

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 194-196. — [2] *Ibid.,* p. 196-201.

[3] I.e., necessity, aseity, sovereign perfection, infinity, simplicity (pure actuality), truth, goodness.

[4] I.e., Life, knowledge, will, omnipotence.

[5] L. Mahif.u, *ibid.,* p. 201. — [6] See above, p. 782-783.

[7] L Mahieu, *ibid.,* p. 431 sq., 507. — [8] *De Dea,* vol. Ill, bk. in, c. 5, 9, 10.

[9] *Ibid.,* bk. tv, c. 5, n. 2-9. Cf. L. Mahiev, *op. cil.,* p. 356 and 505.

is congruism [1]. The detailed explanations given in previous chapters allow us to outline it here in a few words. Suarez admits that grace is efficacious *ab extrínseco* by means of the consent given by the will to the grace that is held out, provided, however, that this grace is congruent. This congruence derives less from any intrinsic quality or intensity [2] than from a group of circumstances not essential to grace, and the infallible connexion between grace and consent exists in God alone by virtue of His knowledge of contingent future events *(scientia media).*

2. Suarez draws much nearer to the Augustinians in his doctrine of predestination and reprobation [3][4]. He does not admit that both of these are *post prcevisa inerita vel demerita* (opinion of Vasquez and Lessius and, in all likelihood, of Molina). To his mind, as well as for Bannez, they are, in God, acts of will, independent of all foreseeing of future or conditional acts. In order to explain reprobation, Thomists distinguish a twofold divine will, one termed *antecedent* regarding the object *in se,* i. e., men as such, the other, termed *consequent* which envisages them together with the reasons which allow the loss of some men; *Suaves* prefers to distinguish predestination to glory which is ■¿.*positive* and affirmative act of will, from reprobation which is a *negative* rather than positive act. On the other hand, whilst Bannez considers the efficacious graces, granted or withheld by God subsequent to His decrees, as being physically predetermining, Suarez regards them as being infallibly efficacious only because of their congruence with the will.

3. Sacraments. — *a)* With the Thomists, Suarez admits a true physical causality in the sacraments, though he explains it by means of a very personal theory [4]: the instrument, he says, acts under the influence of the chief cause by exciting the *active obediential potentiality :* he grants the power of producing supernatural effects to a natural cause by the intermediary of divine co-operation; a teaching as ingenious as it is bold, which, furthermore, he uses to explain the influence of Christ's human nature and the operation of fire in hell.

b) His explanation of the Holy Eucharist reflects his metaphysical ideas on *quantity,* corporeal substance and place; it does not lack originality. In his opinion the sacramental presence of the Body of Christ does not essentially depend on the existence of this Body, nor on its natural

1 Quillet, *Congruisme, op. cit.*
2 Unlike Augustinian congruism (See p. 759 sq).
3 L. Mahieu, *op. cit.,* p. 444-448.
4 *Ibid.,* p. 410-418. Cf. 1'. Pourrat, *Théol. sacram.,* p. 169 sq.

presence in a place; it could have been effected before the Incarnation just as it could be perpetuated even should the Body of Christ no longer exist in heaven [7]. This presence is *local,* in the sense that the bodily presence of Christ fills the space of the host, but it is at the same time essentially supernatural since it places the corporeal substance entire and undivided in the whole space and in each of its parts, " by a certain repetition of the presence of the whole subject in every part of the space " [1]. The cause of this presence is transsubstantiation which he conceives as a " preservation " of the Body of Christ under the species, a preservation that possesses all the characteristics of a true reproductions. Finally, Suarez set forth a new explanation of the essence of the Sacrifice of the Mass [4].

C) Christ and the Church. Moral and Spiritual Theology.

i. Christ and Mary. ¿zJThe motive of the Incarnation is both the perfection of the universe and the Redemption [5]. But Suarez admits that even had man not sinned, the Word would have been made flesh. His teaching thus links hands with that of Scotus.

b) The hypostatic union is explained by his theory of subsistence, a substantial *modality* added to essence and existence. This excellently explains the integrity of human nature in Christ, but makes it difficult and perhaps impossible to shew the *real* union of the two natures[6].*

c) St. Thomas ascribes three kinds of knowledge to Christ : the beatific vision, the infused knowledge of angels, and acquired human knowledge (experimental and intellectual). *Suarez* says that this latter (intellectual knowledge) was given to Christ at an earlv hour by divine infusion [7]. On the other hand, he tends somewhat to diminish this knowledge.

d) As regards the difficult conciliation of the freedom of Christ and the command that He should die, Suarez, does not admit, as do the Ihomists, a formal command, nor even a partial or conditional command or yet a simple desire : he admits in God an absolute *will* though not imperative, a *complacence* as regards the death of the Saviour on the Cross[8].

1 *De Euch.,* Disp. 48, sect. I-2.
8 *Ibid.,* sect. I, n. 11.
3 *Ibid.,* disp. 50, sect. 4, n. 10; cf. sect. 5.
4 M. I.EI'IN, *L'idée du sacrifice de la Messe,* p. 366-379
5 A. Michel, *Incarnation,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1496.
6 L. Mahieu, *op. cit.,* p. 502. — *t Ibid.,* p. 493-494
8 A. *Jésus-Christ,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 1306.

Suarez fortunately differed from the Thomist School[1] on the question of the Immaculate Conception. Moreover in the XVIth century the teaching in favour of Mary's great privilege was becoming general and was professed by many orders and congregations; it became official in the Society of Jesus in 1593. Like Saint Canisius and St. Robert Bellarmine, Suarez threw the weight of his great authority on the side of the pious tradition [2].

2. The CHURCH, perpetuating the Saviour, possesses for the fulfilment of its mission absolute rights which were never so decried as in the XVIth century when Protestantism first saw the light. In various treatises Suarez defended these rights, especially ecclesiastical immunity [3] and the indirect power of the Church over the State (in his famous *Defensio fidei).* The great work *De legibus,* which won for its author a reputation as an eminent canonist, is also in a very special way a treatise of moral theology.

3. Moral and Spiritual Theology. — As a moralist Suarez was rightly renowned for his theoretical developments in the manner of St Thomas [4], rather than for his casuistry. His principal work on this subject is the *De legibus:* a vast commentary of 19 questions of the *Summa,* one of the most voluminous and profound ever written. No less important in some respects is his *De religione* containing, in addition to a general treatise on Christian spirituality, a volume of answers to calumniators of the Society of Jesus.

In one of the books of the *De religione* Suarez has summed up his ideas on Christian mysticism, particularly its fundamental element, *contemplation* [5]. He borrowed much from early writers, particularly the Victorines and St. Thomas. In his views contemplation is an attentive and steady consideration of divine truth by a soul that savours and feels it while it loves it. Of itself it consists in a simple act, though it may be consequent on discursive reasoning. 'Three gifts of the Holy Ghost contribute to its production: understanding which penetrates to the truth, knowledge and wisdom that allow it to be savoured (in God Himself or in His works). In short, this act, *in se,* may be prolonged

[1] However, in the With century many Dominicans favoured this pious belief. We may mention, in addition to Catharinus, St. Louis Bertrand (d. 1581). Ci. X. Le Bachelet, *Innin Concept.,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 1130-1133.

[2] *Ibid.,* col. 1130-1140.

[3] Op. *De immunitate* completing the *De censuris.*

[4] J. de Bl.IC, *Jésuites,* in *Did. théol., co*\. 10S8.

[5] A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union a Dieu,* p. 3°^'31^.

[6] *De religione,* Bk. 11, ch. 9› I0· IIe

by the operation of love which produces in turn praise and thanksgiving, admiration and respect, devotion, submission, and perfect joy, This *(active* and *perfect)* contemplation is peculiar to the unitive way and a privilege of perfect souls. It may so absorb the soul as to preclude the use of the external senses (ecstasy). This teaching gives us a new and charming aspect of the soul of Suarez, the *pious* theologian.

CHAPTER VII.

Spirituality at the Renaissance.

Special Bibliography : See the notes for each author,

I. VARIOUS TENDENCIES.

The intense intellectual movement occasioned by the Renaissance covered so wide a field that it was bound to affect spiritual teaching. And first, many Christian humanists were anxious to influence their contemporaries from a moral viewpoint; this is witnessed by their works, those of Erasmus, for instance r. The ideal they held up, was, in most cases, noble; but the humanist interests with which it was combined both in their own minds and in their writings were usually so predominant that the supernatural aspect tended to be overshadowed. Mysticism in the true sense of the word, with one or two exceptions, was neglected by humanists in favour of a moral teaching flavoured with a very moderate and much more speculative than practical asceticism. St. Francis of Sales, however, found the secret of combining the purest mysticism with the fine flower of humanism; despite its roses his ascetic teaching hides many a thorn; but the Bishop *of* Geneva was an exception.

At the other extrerne in this century of intellectual effervescence we find an extraordinary multiplication of pseudo-mystical sects. Indeed, Lutheranism itself was in some ways no more than a false, heretical and rebellious mysticism*: throughout the whole of Germany it produced a strange brood. Even in Spain a country far distant from the Protestant atmosphere, false mysticism daily encroached and grew into a serious menace with the Alumbrados or *illuminati*^

1 See above, p. 721. — 3 See p. 724.

3 Menendez y Pelavo, *Historia de los heterodoxos españoles,* Madrid, 1881-1882; vol. ii, p. 521-559; vol. ni, 403-408. G. Constant, *Alumbrados,* in *Did. Hist.,* col. 849-853.

At the beginning of the XVIth century they were first heard of in Andalusia and the Church thundered edicts against them for more than a hundred years. They possessed no well-defined doctrines. Nevertheless, they all claimed to be able to reach a state of perfection in which man can no longer sin, or at least, in which sin is no longer sin; hence the shameful consequences reached by some of them. They rejected ecclesiastical hierarchy and the veneration of images and derided the practice of good works. Their quietism, derived from medieval pseudo-mystics, had much in common with Protestantism and opened up the way for the latter's penetration into the Peninsula. For this reason the Spanish Inquisition vigorously reacted against all that savoured of mysticism *.

The anti-mystical opposition 2 was led not only by rhe courts of the inquisition, but also by well-meaning theologians, especially the humanists. In the forefront was found *Melchior Cano.* This hot-headed adversary of illuminism found it wherever he looked, and it has been said that he was, on account of his prejudices, " the evil genius of the great inquisitor, Fernando de Valdes "3, Archbishop of Seville. He denounced and obtained a long period of imprisonment for Carranza, his colleague and rival, who had become Archbishop of Toledo and a cardinal4. Luis of Granada was also suspected of illuminism as were also St. Ignatius Loyola and most Jesuits. Luis de Leon remained several years in prison and other eminent authors saw their works placed on the Index or at least regarded with suspicion. These rigorous measures were due to, though not justified by, the widespread abuse of mysticism.

Yet the real doctrinal reaction against false mysticism whether Protestant or otherwise came from the great spiritual teachers whom God raised up in the XVIth century. Their constructive work achieved what rigorous measures could only prepare. The work of St. Ignatius, mystical perhaps in tendency, but radically ascetic in all essentials, must be placed in the first rank. It was completed in the mystical domain by the unrivalled work of the two founders of the reformed Carmelite school, St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross. St. Francis of Sales admirably blended the ascetic and mystical tendencies in a work which is also redolent of humanism, " devout humanism "5. We shall lay special

* Works written in Spanish and thus tending to spread spiritual teachings, were held in great suspicion.

2 A. SaUDREAU, *Le mouvement anti-mystique en Espagne au λ'YI< s.,* ïn*Rev. cl. fr.,* 1917 (vol. 91), p. 193-206.

3 P. POURRAT, *La spirit, chrét.·,* ill, p. 153.

4 On account of his *Commentaires sur le catéchisme chrétien,* Brussels, 1558 ll an excellent and wholly practical work ,.says I. Iol'rrai (p. 1Ó5), "a simóle exolanation of Christian doctrine in a form accessible to all in which^Cano " found almost Lutheran propositions!

5 See above, p. 725·

stress on the teaching of these three latter teachers, a teaching which despite its obvious traditional nature is so personal and original not only in its method but also in its ideas.

II. EARLY SCHOOLS.

It would be unjust when explaining the new forms put on by spiritual teaching in the XVIth century to overlook the early schools which contained the germ of the revival. The majority of the older Orders had some eminent master who allied the qualities of his school in some measure to the outstanding features of the Renaissance. The spiritual authors of the XVIth century who did not belong to a religious Order are rare. There were some, nevertheless, in addition to St. Francis of Sales. One of the most outstanding was John of Avila [1] (1500-1569) the apostle of Andalusia, beatified by Leo XIII (1894); he corresponded with most of the saintly persons of his time, especially St. Teresa, whom he re-assured regarding the way she had taken. He was deeply read in spiritual matters and wrote an *Explanation of the verse: Audifilia et vide* (PS. XLIV), a real treatise on spirituality.

i. Benedictines.

Garcia de Cisneros - (1455-1510), Abbot of Montserrat, reformed his abbey with the aid of the spiritual Exercises he imposed on his monks. His book *Ejercitatorio de la vida espiritual* forms the first attempt at a methodical systematisation of prayer and was used by St. Ignatius; hence its importance. It contains four parts. The first three contain a graduated series of meditations intended to cleanse the soul of its sins (l), to enlighten it as regards spiritual realities (it), to unite it to God by the consideration of His perfections (ill). 'Lhe fourth deals particularly with contemplation and the degrees of perfect love. Each part, and especially the first three, covers the space of a week and thus the author gives a subject of meditation for each day and lays down the manner of performing it, the place, the time and the order to be followed. The work thus constitutes a retreat *of* several weeks, destined to revive spiritual fervour. As an aid to this fervour, Cisneros counselled the better chanting of the office ; hence his other book: *Guide to the Canonical Hours.* His book of Exercises makes of the Abbot of Montserrat the most famous of the pioneers[3] of methodical meditation before St. Ignatius, who, incidentally, owes much to him.

[1] Hurter, *Nomenclator,* in, 135*137· Cf. P. Pourrat, *La spirit, chrit.,* π, 159-163. — [3] P. Pourrat, *La spirit, chrit.,* in, p. 28-33.

J Vairigant s study, *Quelques promoteurs de la méditation au* A *l·' s.,* in *Bibliothèque des Exercices de* 5. *^ace,* p. 35.61. One who inspired

Louis of Blois (1506-1566) of noble birth, entered the Benedictine Abbey of Liessies in France as a youth and also reformed his monastery by the practice of prayer. He wrote a goodly number of spiritual opuscula, especially the *Institutio spiritualis* which summarises them al, and an *Apology for Tauler* whom Luther had besmirched and whom John Eck had too easily thrown over[1].

2. Dominicans.

Louis of Granada[2] (1504-1588) was the leading spiritual teacher in the Dominican Order in the XVIth century: Cajetan and Cano were mainly theologians; Louis, on the contrary, was chiefly preoccupied with the good of souls. II is *Book of Prayer and Meditation* was meant for the laity[3] and taught the practice of ordinary prayer. He explained its method and proposed a series cf subjects. He borrowed from Cisneros and also, probably, from St. Ignatius. He himself was one day to be used as a model by the Bishop of Geneva. Even more famous was his *Guide for Sinners* which teaches all Christians the reasons and means for combating sin and acquiring virtue. Both these and other writings made Louis one of the best ascetic writers of his time and he might have been a great mystical author had not circumstances prevented him from treating more thoroughly these lofty spiritual questions.

Bartholomew of Braga[4] (1514-1590) Archbishop of Braga, a very influential member of the Council of Trent, wrote a very sound treatise on spirituality, *Compendium vita spiritualis.*

Theologians such as *Cajetan, Cano, Bannes,* treated many different aspects of spiritual life: Bannez indeed, together with Fathers Ibanez and Garcia de Toledo, was to become the director and support of St. Teresa.

3. Franciscans.

Francis of Ossuna[5] (d. about 1540) a Friar Minor of the observance, general commissioner for India, is best known as the author of three *Abecedaria* of spirituality. The *Third Abecedarium,* the first to appear, (1527) was a mystical treatise meant for the general reader. Fearing it might be misunderstood, the author soon afterwards published the *First Abecedarium* dealing with veneration for the Passion of Christ, and the *Second Abecedarium,* an ascetic treatise. The Third however,

Cisneros was John Mauburnus or Mombaer (d. 1502) .Abbot of Livry, author of a *Rosetum exercitiorum spiritualium et sacrai um meditationum.* Cf. Debongnie, */. Mombaer de Bruxelles,* Louvain, 1928. Mombaer himself was influenced by Windesheim where he had been educated. Since (he Middle .Ages attempts had of course been made to systematise prayer (see p. 451 and p. 69S) but these beginnings were not completed until the Renaissance, when the method was brought to a degree of perfection previously unattained.

1 P. Pourrat, *o/>. cit.,* p. 34, 113-115.

3 M. II. La VOCAT, *Louis de Grenada,* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 953-959. P. Pourrat, *of>. cit.,* p. 131-132, 143-153-

3 For this reason the work was censured by the Spanish Inquisition.

4 MANDONNET, *Barth, des M.,* in *Did. théol.,* col. 436-437.

s P. Pourrat, *ot>. cit.,* nr, p. 133-137·

remains the most important, both because of its contents and the happy influence it had on St. Teresa whom it introduced to the interior life *.

St. Peter of Alcantara* 0499* 1562) superior of a province of discalced Friars Minor and founder of a new reformed province was a man of intense prayer: he wrote down the fruits of his experience in a *Treatise of Prayer and Meditation,* similar to that of Louis of Granada on which he modelled his work3. In a dark hour he proved a valuable mainstay to St. Teresa and urged the saint to a stricter poverty in her reform4. Several other xvith century Franciscans also wrote interesting spiritual works5.

4. Augustinians *(Hermits of St. A.).*

St. Thomas of Villeneuve (1488-1555) Archbishop of Valencia, a zealous reformer of his diocese, set out in an important oratorical work 6 a spiritual doctrine as lofty as it is practical; it justifies the title of Apostle of Charity which the good works of the holy archbishop so rightly earned for him.

Luis de Leon7 (1527-1591) an Augustinian of Salamanca, Vicar General of the Order in 1588, then Provincial of Castille, enjoyed a great scientific and literary renown both in his Order and in the whole country. His literary style was of the purest. His best work was conceived in the dungeons of the Inquisition 8, *The Names of Christ,* a fine explanation of the titles of Our Lord, His grandeur, His work, and our duties towards Him. The literary beauty of the work adds to the flame of piety that burns on every page.

Thomas of Jesus9 (1530-1532) Portuguese, brother to the theologian of Andrada mentioned above ,0, wrote pious meditations on *The Sufferings of Our Lordfesus Christ,* composed during a long and painful captivity among the Moors.

III. NEW SCHOOLS. ASCETICISM.

THE IGNATIAN SCHOOL.

The new schools turned their attention to spirituality as a whole. The Carmelite school, however, especially stressed the mystic aspect, while St. Ignatius gave fresh

* *Life written by herself,* c. 4. — 3 P. Pourrat, *ibid.,* p. 139-141.

3 Unless the latter drew his inspiration from St. Peter, as the Franciscans think.

4 *Life written by herself,* c. 30, 35.

5 See Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 138, 142, etc.

6 Latin edit., Salamanca, 1761-1764, 5 vols (sermons for Advent, I, Lent, 2, the mysteries, 3, the Saints, 4, Sundays, 5). New Latin edit., by the Augustinians of the Philippines in 6 vols, Manilla, 1881. Special edition of *Opuscula,* Valladolid, 1885.

1 P. Pourrat, *op. cit.*. p. 180-183.

In 1561 Luis de Leon was rash enough to write a commentary of the *Canticle of Canticles,* which, despite its fine qualities, came al the wrong moment.

9 p. POURRAT, *op. cit.,* p. 183-186. — 10 See above, p. 737.

life to asceticism. At this juncture our concern is with the latter and especially his *Exercises* by means of which the founder of the Society of Jesus came into doctrinal contact with every class of society.

St. Ignatius Loyola[1] (1491-1556) wrote but little[2], and even his immortal *Spiritual Exercises*[3] were not composed originally for the public. They were simple notes in which the recent convert wrote down his personal reflections whenever he observed some deep and intense spiritual movement in his own soul. The mystical experiences of Ignatius were the most limpid sources of his work. So abundant were the graces he received on his conversion that in later years he said they sufficed him for all that touched salvation, even should the Scriptures and all other documents of our holy faith, by some impossible chance, be lost[4]. He did not in fact use many other sources. They must not, however, be passed over. The starting point of his conversion, as is well known, was his pious reading at Loyola in 1521 while recovering from a wound received at Pampeluna. At this time he read no more than the *Life of Jesus Christ* by Ludolph the Carthusian[5] and the *Golden Legend* of Jacopo de Voragine[6]. He had been given no literary education and was quite incapable of tackling a theological work. During a retreat made at the Benedictine

1 J. Brucker, *Ignace de Loyola (saint),* in *Did. théol.,* col. 722-731. A. Brou, *La spiritualité de S. Ignace,* Paris, 1914; *Les Exercices spirituels de S. Ignace de L.,* Paris, 1922. See also H. Joly, *S'. Ignace de L. (Coll. Les Saints),* Paris, 1899.

2 In addition to the *Exercises* there is extant the *Constitutions of the Society 0)Jesus* (1558), *Letters* to the number 0(842, autobiographical notes (1553-1555) dictated to Fr. Gonzalez of Camara and recently translated into French by Fr. E. THIBAUT *(Récit du pèlerin,* Louvain, 1922). For the great editions, see the following note.

3 For all the literature regarding St. Ignatius and his Exercises, see De Backer and Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la C,e de* and the Collection of the *Bibliothèque des Exercices de S. L,* by Fr. Watrigant. Monumental recent edition : in the *Monumenta historica Soc. /esu,* Madrid, section *Monumenta Ignatiana,* 15 volumes now published. The Exercises are in the 2nd series: *Exercitia spiritualia et eorum Directoria,* 1 vol., Madrid, 1919. On this edition, L. de Grandmaison, in *Rech. sc. rei.,* 1920 (vol. 10), p. 391-408 : We have drawn largely on the latter's observations, in the present chapter. Sec also, POURRAT, *La spirit, chrét.,* in, p. 35-74. On the origin of the Exercises, sec H. Watrigant, *La genèse des Ex. de S. Ign.,* in *Etudes,* vol. 71, 72, 73; Dom Besse, *Rev. des Questions hist.,* 1897 (vol. 61), p. 22; II. Bremond, 5. *Ignace et les Exercices* (sec p. 79S. n. 3).

4 Statement made to Laincz, *Monum. Ign.,* series IV, vol. I, p. 204.

5 See above, p. 7oS. 6 See above, P. 64°-

abbey of Montserrat, near Barcelona, he macle the acquaintance of the *Book of Exercises* by *Cisneros* [1] which may have given him the general idea *for his work (methodical series of* meditations and their grouping into weeks); yet his text bears scarcely any trace of direct borrowing, though many passages of the *Imitation* are to be found [2]. In the solitude of Manresa, near Montserrat, in prayer and meditation, he soaked himself in the new truths that were revealed to him by these works and by grace from above. His own great work is a fruit of this collaboration of man and God.

The essential elements *of* the Exercises were composed between 1521 and 1526. They may therefore be said to have been complete when Ignatius decided to go back to the scholar's bench (about 1526)[3], He began with the study of Latin and ending with Theology. During these years in the schools he persuaded chance disciples to follow his Exercises and thus recruited the first members of his Order. The foundation of the latter was begun with the emission of the first private vows at Montmartre, 1534, finally decided upon in 1537, approved for forty members in 1540 and then for any number by Paul III in 1544. While establishing the Society and sending his sons to the four ends of the earth, St. Ignatius was putting the last touches to the Exercises, and having them translated into Castilian [4] and Latins. He brought out the first public edition in 1548[6].

In addition to the text of the Exercises it contained additional notes, several of which are posterior to 1540: the rules of orthodoxy, for instance, which seem to have given Ignatius a real authority over his priests.

In the work as it stands are found four well-defined parts or elements. 1. The Annotations at the beginning are intended to make the Exercises easier to understand both for the preacher and the listener; other notes mingled with the text are given the name of *additions.* 2. The series of Exercises that form the kernel of the

1 See above, p. 792.

3 Which he ascribed to Gerson, hence the title *Little Gerson (pctit-Gerson)* given to the work.

3 At Alcala and Salamanca, then at Paris in 1528.

4 The Castilian of the *Exercises,* says Fr. de Grandmaison, has no literary pretensions. Ignatius' maternal tongue was Basque: he learnt Castilian later, well enough to read and write it correctly *(op. cit.,* p. 397).

5 Several Latin translations were done in his lifetime and one very literal one is perhaps his own handiwork. See the *Monumenta.*

c They exists a little photographic reproduction.

work are planned to last Four Weeks'. In the 1st, St. Ignatius invites his disciple to consider his last end *(Principium* or *Fundamentum)* and after having taught him the rules of self examination and meditation, makes him meditate on sin and hell. In the lind week, the disciple turns his attention to the *lije of Our Saviour,* after having deliberately considered the Reign of Jesus Christ and resolved to serve Him by following His standard in a state of perfection : this *choice,* the turning point of the retreat, is excellently placed at the end of the second week and paves the way for perseverance. The latter is confirmed by meditations on the *Passion of* Christ (illrd week) and die contemplation of His glorious *mysteries* (iv week), during which the disciple endeavours to increase his love of God. 3. The third part isa complete group of MEDITATIONS on the life, death and resurrection of Our Lord, in brief, His mysteries. The subjects are merely indicated and subdivided without development. 4. Four series of RULES bring the work to an end; they regard: *a)* the discernment of spirits (15 for the first week, 8 for the second); *b)* alms-giving (7 rules); r) scruples (6 rules); *d)* orthodoxy (18 rules, *ut cum orthodoxa Ecclesia vere sentiamus').*

Such, in all its simplicity, was the marvellous apostolic instrument Ignatius left in the hands of his followers. I hey have used it with rare success and a remarkable flexibility of application. Yet even this fact, says Fr. de Grand maison, does not make it any easier for us to discover the real underlying intention of St. Ignatius : " The interpretation of the *Exercises* has been complicated by their enormous and lasting success"[2]; and this author counsels those who would truly understand them " to go back to the beginnings and to distinguish " their original and integral purpose " from the later use that has been made of them.

The primary purpose of the Exercises is evident. They "aim before all at an individual case, clearly delimited : their purpose is to enable a man, still free to choose his mode of life but truly gifted for apostleship, to reach a state of mind in which he may clearly discern and generously follow the call of God... Such is the hypothesis of St. Ignatius and it is the only viewpoint that really does justice to his plan, allows a bird's eye view of the whole scheme, explains what it involves and what it lacks, what the author really meant and what he neither desired not even thought of including"[3]. In particular "this mixture of very simple lectures and extremely austere exactions is perfectly explicable... He who engages himself to persevere to the end is judged to be both a beginner who needs instruction in asceticism and a generous soul able to submit to the most costly sacrifices and appreciate the noblest lessons of the Gospels. This point of view similarly illuminates the most original and urgent part of the work,

1 The word *week* is to be taken in a wide sense as indicating a fixed series of days, longer or shorter at will : the 2nd week plans exercises for twelve days.

3 *Of. cit.,* p. 398. — 3 *Ibid.,* p. 400-401.

that which culminates in a *choice* of a state of life"[1].* This is the very heart *of* the whole work. The first week is a preparation; the third and the fourth a supplement meant to strengthen the effect of the second, which is wholly concerned with the choice. The question is clearly raised at the outset by means of the meditation on the Reign of Christ and comes to an end on the twelfth day with the rules for making the choice. Between these two extremes passes "a twofold series of Exercises, some of which are intended to reveal in the mysteries of the Saviour's Childhood the essential conditions for the *apostolic life,* others to stengthen, to correct if necessary and render supple the *faculties* that must become obedient to God"[2]. Whilst he thus hastens "the bold yet prudent ascent of the pilgrim whom God, as it would seem, *calls to that summit* whereon He condescends to choose His apostles"[3], Ignatius keeps a look-out for possible erring and like a true soldier, by means of the meditation of the *two Standards,* urges the candidate for the apostolic life to take his stand under the flag of "Christ Our Lord, supreme Captain of the good". At the end of these Exercises the chosen of God will clearly perceive in his soul the signs of the divine call. All that remains is to confirm his loyalty: *this is the aim of the last weeks.* "The choice having been properly made, the remainder of the Exercises, still considerable in number and importance, serve but to confirm the chosen by the contemplation of the sorrowful mysteries; to plunge his vocation into an atmosphere of pure spiritual calm and joy, and to guide him finally, by the traditional ways, towards a lasting divine union and friendship with God, in which is contained all religion in spirit and truth"[4]5

This precise understanding of the primitive intention of St. Ignatius can and must control all the other applications it is possible to make of the Exercises. These are justifiable: "To use the *Exercises* to correct one's way of life in a vocation already known and accepted... such does not go contrary to the author's intentions", although it "deviates from the original purpose of the work"[5]. Nevertheless "for those who are no longer able to dispose freely of their lives, St. Ignatius proposes a little scheme for reform and correction"[6]. It is, moreover, quite possible to adapt the entire plan of the Exercises to a soul already fixed in its way of life so that during the retreat it "may discover and follow the call of the Holy Ghost to lead a new life in its present vocation"[7]. Such, indeed, "is the

[1] *Ibid.,* p. 401-402.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 402. — [3] *Ibid.*
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 404. As regards the original intention of the Exercises new opinions may be found in an interesting note by H. Bremond who, in many ways, agrees with Fr. De Grandmaison. *Vie spirituelle,* 1929 (vol. 20), P· [1·471» Í73111] *(S. Ignace et les Exercices).* See *ibid.,* February and April 1930.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 401. — [6] *Ibid.,* note 2. — [7] *Ibid.,* p. 404, note 2.

closest approximation to the original version " of Ignatius' work.

But whether distant or close, the adaptations that have been made during four hundred years are countless, both in form and number. Any acquaintance with them will provide an idea *of* the practical influence of the Exercises. " With this astonishing tool in their hands, the Jesuits and all who have followed in their steps have endeavoured to make it give of its best in every case. Hence have sprung innumerable applications, arrangements, attenuations; hence a continual harvest of *Retreats, Manresas, Meditations* "according to the method of the Exercises ". Public or private retreats, preached or directed, open to all the faithful or "closed", discreetly suggested to a single person or proposed to a chosen group; retreats for priests and religious, or for layfolk... ; retreats given to Catholics, to Anglicans, nay even to the most Protestant; retreats of a day, three days, a week, long retreats of thirty days or more. These varieties, these different kinds of application are far from new. The official *Directory of* the Society'... definitely provides for people of every class... who, it is thought, should share in a greater or lesser measure the treasure of the Exercises. In this, the *Directory* does no more than summarise practices indicated in previous *Directories,* all more or less authorised, several going back to the first days of the Order, one or two to St. Ignatius himself[2]. In this popularisation of the *Exercises* there is nothing, therefore, that goes against the Founder's intentions"[3] Of recent years, Pope Pius XI counselled spiritual retreats for the laity in the Encyclical *Mens nostra* (Dec. 20th, 1929) and confirmed with his eminent authority the exceptional usefulness of the Exercises for this purpose and the outstanding part they have played in the spreading of this pious practice [4]

We have referred above[5] to the doctrinal influence of the *Exercises* insofar as grace is in question. By urging his followers to stress human freewill in their preaching, St. Ignatius indirectly provoked the creation of the new *theological system* elaborated by Molina. He threw man's liberty into startling relief, with the avowed purpose of reacting against Protestant pessimism ; thus, though in no wise a humanist, he discreetly guided his Order towards that decided *optimism* which the humanists contrasted with the theologians' habitual insistence on the frailties of fallen

[1] First published in 1591, then in its final edition eight years later.

[2] See the *Monumenta Ignatlana* (above, p. 795).

[3] L. de Grandmaison, *lin'd.,* p. 398-400. The author continues: " We must nevertheless avow that the primary purpose of the work and its essential qualities tend to be obscured, to become remarkably attenuated in its successors ", *(Ibid.,* p. 400). On the other hand, however, we must recognise the great value of these adaptations coming from the hands of experienced teachers.

[4] Cf. J. Lebreton, in *Etudes,* Jan. 20th, 1930, p. 129-140.

[5] See p. 764.

nature. The influence of the *Exercises,* however, was naturally more evident in spiritual matters. Their teaching is radically *ascetic,* set out with a methodical precision never previously realised both as regards the external arrangement of the exercises and the discipline of the faculties[1]. The principles laid down allowed the sons of St. Ignatius to build upon them a complete ascetic theology; yet the Exercises themselves cannot be regarded as "a complete manual of asceticism" for they do not contain "detailed guidance" for every case. The reason for this is to be found in what we have already said concerning the author's primary purpose[2]. The same reasons explain why the *Exercises* contain no explicit and direct initiation to the mystical ways and graces, although, as Fr. de Grandmaison observes, it is possible to find "manifest traces" of these ways and graces. Nevertheless, knowing St. Ignatius' exact intention, we should be rash in concluding from his silence that he conceived a true and complete state of perfection without the mystical graces in question. His work certainly provides a sure and needful, though indirect, preparation for the latterà

The disciples of St. Ignatius have perpetuated his influence and stressed particularly the ascetic aspect of the spiritual life. Some, nevertheless, even in the early years, also dwelt on the mystical graces[4]. The best known among those of the XVIth century are as follows.

St. Francis Borgia[5] (1510-1572) General of the Society in 1565, was "a great contemplative" according to St. Teresa[6]. Of writings he has left but a few short spiritual *opuscula* and a personal diary

[1] The methodis best characterised in the meditation. It comprises: the preparatory prayer, two preludes (composition of the place...), considerations or the meditation in the true sense, and colloquies. The considerations in 3 or 5 points are usually carried out by means of a methodical application of the three faculties, memory, understanding and will, each applied to the subject in the right order. Occasionally, however, the meditation is made by applying the five senses, or by manner of *contemplation* (applications to persons, words, acts). St. Ignatius also teaches *two other simple ways* of prayer. Being very fond of these individual exercises St. Ignatius suppressed the choir office in order to encourage their practice among his religious.

[2] See L. de Grandmaison, *ibid.,* p. 404-405.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 406-407.

[4] H. Bremond even speaks of two opposed schools, both invoking the authority of the Exercises. See the conclusion of the study mentioned above, p. 795, and the *Hist, dit sentiment religieux,* vol. viii, p. 179 sq.

[5] Hurter, *Nomenclator,* iii, 136-137.

[6] Who was reassured by him concerning her interior life.

(Diarium). Still less is extant of the work of **Balthazar Alvarez** [1] (1533-1580) who, in the year that followed his ordination, became St. Teresa's confessor at Avila. He himself later attained to contemplative prayer; his teaching on this matter, however, was reproved by the general of the Society, Mercurian. He died provincial of Toledo.

Louis du **Pont**[2] (1554-1624) who spent his life in directing souls, was the biographer of Alvarez, wrote a great number of spiritual treatises *(Meditations, Spiritual Guide,...).* He treated not only of asceticism but also of the mystic life.

St. Alphonsus **Rodríguez**[3] (1531-1617) became a Jesuit brother coadjutor in 1571 in the island of Majorca, reached a high state of contemplation and described his state in 21 mémoires (hence his *Life)* as well as various *opuscula* (especially *On the union and the transformation of the soul in God; Explanation of the petitions of the Pater,* Fr. trans., Lille, 1894).

Alphonsus **Rodriguez** [4] (1526-1616) was novice master for many years and responsible for maintaining within the Order the method of prayer found in the Exercises. He is well known for his ascetic work *Practice of Perfection,* a book which is everywhere highly considered, despite certain of his prejudices against mystical prayers : it deals with the virtues from a very practical angle.

Alvarez de **Paz** [5] (1560-1620) wrote a complete treatise of spirituality, *De vita spirituali ejusque perfectione* (3 vols) with which may be likened that of the French Jesuit, Le **Gaudier** (d. 1622), *De perfectione vitee spiritualis* (3 vols).

The spiritual writings of the great Jesuit theologians, *Bellarniine, Suarez, Lessius,* are dealt with elsewhere, as well as the opuscula of St. Peter Canisius.

The influence of St. Ignatius is again to be seen in the *Spiritual Combat*[6] one of the best ascetic writings of the XVith century, and which is indisputably the work of the Theatine, Scupoli (1530-1610). The first edition of this writing in 1589 contained but 24 chapters; these were later increased to 70, thereby spoiling somewhat the unity of the book. Having given a general idea of the spiritual life the pious author urges those souls desirous of perfection to fight evil by distrust in self and trust in God, by the methodical employment of the faculties, which the author draws up in battle order in St. Ignatius' manner and finally,

[1] See P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 171-179. The life of Fr. Alvarez has been written by L. DE Pont, Madrid, 1615 (re-ed., La Torre, 1880; Fr. trans., Bouix, 1873, Couderc, 1912). Cf. H. Bremond, *op. cit.,* p. 22S-325.

[3] P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* p. 320-325. A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 318-324.

[3] P. Pourrat, *did.,* p. 326-328. A. Saudreau, *ibid.,* p. 305-308.

[4] P. Pourrat, *ibid.,* p. 315.319.

[5] P. Pourrat, *ibid.,* p. 328-336. A. Saudreau, *ibid.,* p. 338-340.

[6] P. Pourrat, *ibid.,* p. 358-368.

by a very simple method of prayer or meditation. Though hardly the peer of the *Imitation* whose pious accents sink deeper still, the *Spiritual Combat* rightly enjoys great esteem. It was, for long, one of the bedside books of St. Francis of Sales.

CHAPTER VIII.

Saint Teresa,

Special Bibliography :

Editions: The 1st is dated 1588, Salamanca (Luis de Leon ed.). The last (critical) by Fr. Silverio de Sa Teresa, *Obras de Sa T,* Burgos, 9 vols, 1915-1927. Recent Fr. trans. : Cannelites de Paris (Brussels), 6 vols, Paris, *Œuvres complètes,* 1907-1910 (edit, quoted here). *Lettres* trans-, by G. de S. Joseph, 3 vols, 1902. By the same, new trans, of the *Œuvres complètes de Su Thérèse,* (Coll. *La Vie spiriti},* Tournai, 4 vols, 1928 sq. Cf. partial English translations in *Cath. Encyc.,* 1913 ed., vol. 14, p. 516 d.

Studies; *Histoire de Su Thérèse* by a Carmelite of Caen (after the Bollandists), 2 vols, Paris, 1885. H. JOLY, *Sainte Thérèse,* Paris, 1901 (Coll. *Les Saints).* L. Bertrand, *Slt Thérèse,* Paris, 1927. R. HOORNAERT, *Ste Thérèse écrivain,* Paris-Lille, 1922. G. Etche-GOYEN, *Eamour divin. Essai sur les sources de Su Thérèse,* Bordeaux-Paris, 1923. A. Poulain, S. J., *Les grâces d'oraison* (see above, p. 361), A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 258-278 : the other works of the same author mentioned on p. 361 contain the same teaching. P. PQURRAT, *La spiritualité chrétienne,* III, Paris, 1925, p. 187-268. A. 'I ANQUER'EY, *Précis de théol. ascétique et mystique,* Paris-Tournai. 1925, p. 888-927. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Doctrine de S" Thérèse, Caractères essentiels des états mystiques,* in *Vie spirit.,* Oct. 1927 (vol. 7), p. 114-139. All this October n° of the *Vie spirit.,* is devoted to St. Teresa and her school : Life (Carmelites of Lille) p. 5-29; ascents (Petitot) p. 30-73; general meditations (C. A.) p. 74-113: Carmelite school (Carmelites of Lille), p. 140-165. Works on St. Teresa are innumerable : a special bibliographical woik would be useful. See the fine Bibliog., by Hoornaert, *op. cit.,* p. xm-xix.

I. LIFE (1515-1582) AND WORKS OF THE SAINT.

A). The Life of St. Teresa written by herself.

Towards the end of the life of the saint who had paved the way tor a revival of Christian asceticism against Protestantism, God was quietly preparing St. Teresa to give new life to mysticism. In 1556 she had just begun to make great progress in the ways of perfection. In the previous year, 1555, the twentieth year of her religious life, a very special grace had brought about her conversion. We must make the meaning of this term clearer. Used of St. Teresa it does not mean the change from a life of sin to one of grace, nor from lukewarmness to fervour, but rather a definite passing from a fervent and virtuous life to one that was wholly perfect. A passing, as it were, from the illuminative to the *unitive way.* This transformation, usually slow and almost unperceived, was in her case the effect of an exceptionally powerful grace vouchsafed at the sight of an *Ecce homo* and her reading of the *Confessions of St. Augustine* L Henceforward not only did she never cease from dwelling in supernatural heights of prayer, but decided also to *preach them* to others. And first *by her own example;* constantly advancing, she attained, seventeen years later, to that transforming union she has described in the *Castle* and passed the last ten years of her life in a state of the most heroic holiness. She called on others to follow her, and her *religious reform,* begun in 1562, had no other purpose than the bringing of chosen souls to this perfect union with God. To this life of perfect prayer she "converted" even her directors and confessors; several of these saintly men sat at her feet, such, for instance, it would seem, as Fathers Ibanez, Bannez and Garcia who guided her about 1562 1. These, the better to know her, and also for their own edification, urged her to write. Thus, in spite of herself, she became a writer in order to preach her great crusade.

Her first work is the Life written by herself[3], primarily intended to enlighten her directors on her interior life. In this work she could

1 *Life,* ch. 9. Here the *Confessions* helped her to give herself wholly to God. Later, at the end of her life, 1577 (*Castle,* vi, c. 7, p. 234) she found therein an example of the ascent to God through created things. See below, p. 812 *(active contemplation).* Most of St. Teresa's mystical experiences were due to grace alone, though God at times seems to have made use also of her reading, which however, was not extensive. Among these sources, we know, in addition to St. Augustine, the "Letters" of St. Jerome *{Life,* 3, 11 : *Castle,* vi, 9); St. Gregory's " Moralia" *{Life,* 5; *Ji ay,* 12); The " *Lije ofJ. C. "* by Ludolph the C. *{Life,* 38; *Castle,* vn, 4); the "Imitation of J. (' . " (Iffy/, 38; *Castle,* v, 2). It is also known that she read more recent works, especially by the Franciscans, St. Peter of Alcantara, and Francis of Ossuna whose *Third Abecedarium* brought to her knowledge the prayer of recollection.

3 See the *Life,* c. 16, vol. I', p. 206.

3 See R. Hoornaert, *op. cit.,* p. 396-405.

not help comparing with the graces she had been granted, the *great sins* she had committed, or at least what seemed to her to be great in the supernatural light that now inundated her soul. The work was first written about 1561-1562 and continually revised until 1565, when St. Teresa sent it to Blessed John of Avila. It was then, apparently, that the Saint inserted the little treatise on prayer (c. 11-22) the rarest gem of the whole work. The book, which contains 40 chapters, may be divided into ¿*parts*' : «) her life until her conversion (1515-1555); treatise on prayer ; f) her life from 1555 to 1562; *(Γ)* the foundation of Saint Joseph (1562) and the last graces.

In the 1st Part (η. 1-10) she begins by narrating her devout childhood (ch. 1) the dangers she encountered in her youth (2) her vocation (3) and her first fervour (c. 4-6). She merely recalls the virtues of her family and makes no mention of the noble rank of her father, Sanchez de Cepeda and her mother, Beatrix de Ahumada. She accuses herself (in ch. 2) of having read frivolous books and of having mixed with good but rather easy-going people, a circumstance that caused her to be talked about; but she states that she never fell into any serious fault and her confessors told her she was not offending God's laws[1]. She entered the Carmelite convent of the Incarnation at Avila when she was twenty years old in 1535 and was professed in the following year. During the next four years, however, she fell sick of some ailment and had need of special care both in the convent and without[2]. Her first years of religious life were filled with fervour (ch. 4-5). Teresa gave herself up wholly to prayer and even received supernatural graces, especially that of quietude and even that of union. Nevertheless, she always had need of a book to induce the state of prayer and continued thus for twenty years, as she found herself unable to reason discursively or use her imagination.

Her return to health about 1540 coincided with a period of laxity which lasted until 1555 (ch. 7-8). She left off her meditation forayear only, but she allowed herself to be taken up with affections that were too human although otherwise honest, and found pleasure in the visits that were allowed to the unenclosed convent. She was to blame her confessors for not having opened her eyes to the dangers of this mode of life. We must not, however, exaggerate this lukewarmness of which she speaks. Even at this time she had great periods of fervour, one whole year especially ; her virtue was commented upon ; she practised meditation and persuaded others to do the same; already several years

1 Thus distributed : *a)* ch. I-io; *b)* ch. 11-22; *c)* ch. 23-31; *d)* ch. 32-40.

2 *Life,* p. 54, 57.

3 On her illnesses, see L. Bertrand, *op. cit.,* imd P. ; II. Joly, *op. cit.,* p. 27 sq. See also A. Poulain, *Les grâces d'oraison,* p. 580 sq.

before 1555 she was used to receive "spiritual savours and delights in prayer". It may be said that, in general, she was leading a virtuous religious life but nothing out of the ordinary. She had not learnt to do without all human relationships. After her "*conversion*", however, (ch. 9) she sedulously avoided all faults and even voluntary imperfections. As a reward she at once received eminent supernatural favours, especially that contemplative awareness of the presence of God (ch. 10) which forms one of the characteristics of the unitive life.

In consequence, the saint here interpolates a little treatise on prayer *findPart,* ch. 11-22) probably meant for her directors. She compares the soul to a *garden* which is watered by drawing water from a well by hand (1) or better still with a pump (11) or more efficiently by canalising water from a stream (ill) before the rain finally comes from the clouds above (iv). The latter is the ideal method', the irrigation of the soul is brought about by four kinds of prayer : 1. *discursiveprayer* II. *quietude,* ill. *sleep of the faculties,* IV. *prayer of union:* The first is active; the three others passive or infused. The line! and Hird hardly differ save in intensity : the sleep of the faculties is but a deeper quietude. The IVth, union, is simple, or in a higher degree, ecstatic.

Immediately after her conversion St. Teresa was vouchsafed this union, as may be seen in the *Hird Part* of her book (ch. 23-31). In ch. 23 she states that she habitually enjoyed quietude and frequently union, that union which is based on the knowledge of God's presence as we have already mentioned (ch. 10). Soon she was granted, in addition to this *normal basis of the supernatural life,* many *exceptional favours* which she describes in the following chapters: supernatural words (c. 25), intellectual vision of Our Lord (c. 27) or imaginative vision (c. 28). Her active abnegation [2] was perfected by means of *trials* inflicted by God for her purification. The most painful of these latter she owed to confessors who did not always understand her [3]. Of all those who directed her at this period she found *Fr. Balthazar Alvarez, S.f,* "the most useful". He con-

[1] "It seems to me that there are four ways of watering. First, water may be laboriously drawn from a well. A chain-pump and buckets may also be used, and set in motion by means of a crank ; I myself have sometimes used this means : it is less tiring and a larger quantity of water is thus obtained. Water may also be brought from a river or a stream :... Lastly, there is heavy rain, and this is beyond dispute the best of all ways, for here the Lord Himself does the watering without any work on our part. And now I want to apply to my subject these four ways of giving a garden the water it needs *for* its upkeep and without which it would perish. It seems to me that I can thus give a certain idea of the four degrees of prayer to which the Lord, in His mercy, has sometimes raised my soul". *Life,* c. 11, p. 147-148. A graceful but simple comparison. She refers but rarely to it, however, in the moral and mystical explanations that follow. See below (p. 814) summary of the teaching.

[2] Her vow of always doing the most perfect actions dales from this period.

[3] *Vie,* p. 306, 364, 385.

fessed her from 1558 to 1564 with understanding and sympathy. Having been ordained at the age of 25 in 1558, however, he was still young, not entirely free, given to hesitation and suffered in himself at this time from a " lack of interior expansion After *St. Francis Borgia* who gave her peace in 1557, *St. Peter Alcantara,* about 1560, proved of great help to her. He entirely restored her tranquillity and at the same time reassured Fr. Balthazar Alvarez [1].

This saint came as an invaluable help to St. Teresa at the outset of the labours for reform which she began at this period and which are related in the *IVth Part of the Life* (c. 32-40). About 1560, following on a vision of hell (ch. 32) and the thought that souls were being lost by the fault of the Lutherans, she felt her desires for apostleship live again. She conceived the wish to compensate Our Lord by training a select body of holy religious. Hence the idea of reforming Carmel by means of an austere rule, absolute poverty and a more intense life of prayer. With the support of St. Peter of Alcantara and the Dominicans who were guiding her at this time she founded (August 24th, 1562), at Avila, the first convent of discalced Carmelites, dedicated to St. Joseph. *The supernatural favours* which she still enjoyed helped her to advance in the love of Him Who now revealed Himself to her (ch. 40) as the *Truth* from which all truth derives and Who was reflected in her soul as in "a clear mirror"[2].

B). Other Works.

This supernatural light which bathed her soul allowed her to aid her daughters on the way to perfection and it was for them, at the instance of Fr. Bannez, that she wrote, about 1565, the Way of Perfections, the text of which, revised about 1570, soon found its way into all the reformed houses and elsewhere. This work of 42 chapters contains, in addition to an *introduction* (ch. 1-3) *:a)* an *ascetic exhortation* to practise the virtues that prayer requires (supernatural charity, 4-7, and indifference to all things, 8-10, even honour, 11-15); *b)* an instruction on *mental prayer* ch. 16-25 (its nature and conditions for progress...); *c)* lastly, a little treatise on *passive* or contemplative *prayers,* given in the form of considerations

[1] See H. Joly, *op. cit.,* p. 210-216.
[2] *rie,* c. 40 (vol. ii), p. 144.
[3] See R. Hoornaert, *op. cit.,* p. 409-418

on the *Pater* (ch. 26-42) : at this point the Saint classifies the prayers of *recollection* (27-29), *quietude* (30-31) and *union* (32-35); she goes on to point out certains *dangers* to which spiritual persons are prone. The bold and decided tone of this work, its delicate psychological observation and its unfailing practical quality rank it among the most useful treatises on spirituality ever written. It is also one of the most beautiful.

The Saint's interior life, far from hindering her external activity[1] seems, on the contrary, to have stimulated and strengthened it. The proof is seen in the *sixteen new foundations* she undertook after 1567. The great reforming Pope, Saint Pius V (1566-1572) did all in his power to encourage this kind of initiative. In four years (1567-1571) she founded 7 convents of discalced Carmelites in the two Castiles and in 1568, together with Fr. John of the Cross, she established at Durvelo the first reformed monastery *of* Carmelite monks. She was obliged to call a halt while she was prioress of the convent of the Incarnation at Avila, but in 1574 when she was again prioress at St. Joseph she resumed her labours and between 1574 and 1576 founded four more convents, one of which was at Seville in distant Andalusia. A fresh interruption of 4 years was marked by what has been called, only too aptly, the *war of the moderates*[2]. A general chapter of the Order, held at Placentia in 1575, alarmed at the rapid progress of the reformed houses, withdrew the permissions that had been granted, forced concessions that meant the end of the undertaking and required St. Teresa to give up her new foundations. The Nuncio termed her "a restless and vagrant woman". St. John of the Cross was incarcerated in a monastery for six months. The king himself intervened in the Saint's favour and in 1580 she finally *triumphed* with the separation of the reformed houses from the moderate, in the form of distinct provinces.

She macle up for the delay caused by' this opposition by' founding 5 new convents in the last two years of her life. In her Book of Foundations[3] (begun in 1573 and carried on until 1582) the saint herself relates the history of all her houses. In this work more than in any other she gives us her portrait, thanks to her skill in finding the right word, her gift for edifying while remaining interesting and her apostolic zeal. It was during these last years, the most troubled in appearance, that Teresa composed her masterpiece, the Interior Castle[4] written between June 2nd and November 29th 1577 at the request of Fr. Gratian, her superior and confessor. In this work she again explains

[1] Cf. IL J01.Y, *of. at.*, p. 121-189.
[2] II. Joly, *ibid*, p. 173 sq.
[3] Cf. R. HOORNAERT, *of. at.*, p. 431-437.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 419-43°.

ex professo, for the third time, the degrees of prayer which she here compares to the seven mansions of a *castle.* The castle is the *soul* wherein God dwells. The first three mansions represent the several degrees of active prayer and the last four correspond to what have since become the classical degrees of passive prayer. The seventh, the transforming union, is now explained for the first time, as a result of the last and nobler favours granted to the saint since 1572 x.

In addition to the four great treatises we have mentioned, St. Teresa also composed various other writings*, among which we should mention especially :

1. The 66 *Relations* containing information on her state of soul and the graces she received from 156010 1581. These are most valuable documents, and complete the *Life;*

2. The *Exclamations* or prayers (17) and the *Thoughts on the Canticle of Canticles;*

3. The *Constitutions of the Carmelites* and the *Manner of visiting the convents; various documents* relating to the monasteries;

4. *Letters* (more than 300) and 36 poems.

During the last years of her life, St. Teresa combined in a way that is rare in the story of the saints, the highest degree of *contemplative life* with the most intense *active life.* The sublime writer of the *Castle* was the author of the *Foundations* and also of those letters which reveal her as a talented woman whose thorough common sense and tenderness of heart were rivalled only by her strength of character and sound supernatural outlook. Many *trials* came to perfect her purification. In addition to the exterior difficulties we have touched upon and the fatigue and opposition springing from her work of reform, God allowed her to be tried even by her own spiritual daughters; a prioress, her own niece, went so far as to drive her forth from one of her convents, a few weeks before her death 3. She died at Alba de Tonnes (Salamanca) while she was returning to Avila from Burgos, on October 4th 1582. The process of beatification began in 1591 4 and she was canonised in 1622, forty years after her death.

1 See the *Relations* 14 and 15 (May 29th and June 30th, 1571) on the manifestation of the three Divine Persons and *Ret.* 25 (Nov. 1572) for the famous (imaginative) vision in which Christ asks her to be His spouse.

3 Cf. R. Hoornaert, *op. cit.,* p. 437-473.

3 Cf. H. Joly, *op. cit.,* p. 235.

4 Her works had been printed in 1588

II. SPIRITUAL DOCTRINE.

A). General Outline. The Saint's Ascetic Teaching*.

St. Teresa's providential mission seems to have consisted in reacting against the pseudo-mysticism of the Spanish *Illuminati* and that of the Protestants which was then playing havoc in Europe[1]. The historian's duty is to tell of her success. She used as her instrument a *teaching* which, though remaining in the line of tradition, brought with it an astonishing degree of enlightenment. She may rightly be called the Doctor of prayer. We shall attempt to determine her essential ideas on this subject. They are all the more remarkable inasmuch as the Saint drew more on her personal experience than on her reading[2]. The Church rightly exclaims that hers is a "heavenly doctrine". Thus also is explained the influence wielded by Teresa in the *ascetic, mystical* and even *pastoral* domain rather than in the field of controversy. Better than any other she can teach the priest the art of directing souls in the higher ways of the interior life.

I. The most valuable part of the saint's work is her classification and description of supernatural prayers (fruit of the gifts of the Holy Ghost). *Her manner of explaining* is that of a mother exhorting and instructing her children rather than that of a professor. She invariably combines very practical advice with her descriptions of the graces of prayer. Never does she separate the latter from the *general state of the soul* which opens the way for them or co-exists with them. We thus find in St. Teresa's works a solid ascetic teaching wholly in view of the mystical prayers which form their richest treasure. The very core of her asceticism as well as of her mysticism is the love of God. This is best set out in the *Way of Perfection.* but valuable elements are to be found in all her works.

In her ascetic teaching she allots an important place to three fundamental virtues: brotherly love, disinterestedness, humility[3]. She asks of her daughters a *wholly spiritual love of Iheir neighbour* in the course of admirable chapters on prudence and fortitude[4]. She says

1 See R. Hoornaert, *op. cit.*. p- 5°74· (L'atmosphère intellectuelle).
9 *Ibid.,* p. 303-390 (Sources). See also p. 133-164, devoted to the saint's intellectual attainments.
3 *Way of Perf.*. c. 4-15· — 4 *tbid.,* c. 4-7.

to them: Be "strong men"; avoid tender expressions; great dangers lie in the desire to be loved by others; you should love only what is constant in them and what God has given them; such love is spiritual: it is a gift of God; it implies that an entirely heavenly wisdom guides our friendship just as it supposes a deep knowledge of God and the vanity of the world. It is the lot of a few. Furthermore, the saint imposed on her religious the most complete *renunciation*[1] by means of absolute poverty, separation from family, and mortification. She urged them to free themselves from the needs of the body and exaggerated fears for their health. Above all, she exhorted them to mortify themselves interiorly by humility[2]. One fruit of humility, right judgment, seemed to her especially necessary for entering Carmel.

More than any other virtue, however, charity is the very essence of St. Teresa's spirituality and the *Interior Castle* relates the divine story of divine love in the soul. If this is not constantly kept in mind there would be a risk of entirely misunderstanding her teaching[3]. This love is born in the heart as soon as the Christian, *realising* his supernatural dignity as a child of God [1st mansion] endeavours to free himself of the bondage of the senses [lind mansion] and advance in virtue by means of a well regulated life [lllrd mansion]. The sensible consolations as well as the difficulties he meets at the outset already help to strengthen him, but when God intervenes more directly with the first *mystical graces* [ivth mansion], then this love expands and grows. St. Teresa explains that it is precisely the quality of these graces to dilate the soul [dilatasti cor meum], by causing it to savour the sweetness of its God. The soul must take advantage of them by anchoring the will firmly in the Divine will by means of an inflexible and efficacious determination to avoid all deliberate faults and to sacrifice itself. \\ hen the soul has accomplished this and knows that indeed it "looks down from a great height upon the world" it passes into a fresh way : the soul is united with God and *this union* is the result of love, or better, of *charity,* the perfect love that characterises the *higher mansions.* True intimacy is prepared in the brilliant light of the Vth *mansion* and Teresa compares it to a conversation of the soul with God. This friendship grows in the measure that spiritual favours are vouchsafed, favours that kindle love and trials that purify it, in the Vith *mansion;* it is consummated in

[1] *Ibid.,* c. 8-11. — [2] *Ibid.,* c. 12-15.

[3] This analysis of the growth of love according to the *Castle* allows us to compare the Saint's teaching with that of St. Francis of Sales on the same subject. See p. 840.

unbreakable friendship in the Vllth *mansion* where mutual delight, in forgetfulness of self and the union of hearts, rules out the splendour of great manifestations and calls above all for action : the indissoluble bond of *marriage* alone can serve as a symbol for this perfect spiritual union of the soul with God.

To this teaching on the gradual growth of charily through prayer is linked that on the degrees of perfection, nor is it difficult to find therein the *three principal ways* or *stages* to which Christian tradition reduces them. It is of capital importance to observe these relations: virtue remains the surest criterion of the supernatural value of the highest mystical prayers. The first two mansions certainly correspond to the *purgative way;* the last three (vth-vnth) characterised by the unitive prayers, correspond to the *unitive way.* The *illuminative way* is dealt with in the lllrd mansion, which marks advance in virtue, as also, probably, does the ivth, for the mystical graces that enrich it, no matter how precious they are, are clearly to be distinguished from the prayers of union : they do not, therefore, despite their wholly supernatural efficacy, produce that firm attachment of the will to God that forms, in the true sense of the word, the unitive way. They lie nevertheless at the threshold and it may be said that their purpose is to lead the soul to union.

2. St. Teresa's ascetic interests are to be found even in her teaching on prayer. She was indeed attracted by the mystical graces, but not to the point of neglecting active prayer, of which she treats in several works h She takes less pains to indicate a method than to give the *spirit* of prayer and put the aspirant on guard against the obstacles that lie in the way. i) She affirms the *need of* meditation, without classifying its various forms: God alone by His activity can perfect the operation of the mind. Trying to do without Him is a sign of pride[2]. 2) No subject of *meditation* can surpass that of *Our Lord,* His Life, and His Passion. Jesus Christ gives true devotion to those who know how to talk to Him and make affective acts, or who, after reasoning, stay[] in silence by His side[3]. 3) *Deep reflections,* however, are not without their use, especially[] for theologians to whom they are usual; the greatness and majesty of God will raise their hearts, but they[] must not lose Christ from view and must always seek to know themselves better-*. 4) The *purpose* of all consideration is indeed *self-knowledge*[5], liber-

[] *Life,* c. 11-13; *Way,* c. 20-26; *Castle,* 1starci Mans.

[3] *Life,* c. 12-13. — [3] *Ibid.,* c. 12.

[4] *Ibid.; Castle,* 1st M., c. 2.

[5] *Ihid., Castle,* 1st M., c. 2.

ation from the senses and the ordering of the soul and one's daily life by the practice of virtue l.

St. Teresa's idea of mental prayer is quite simple (see especially the *Way,* c. 22-26) : she gives this name to all pious application of the soul to G-od (c. 22); for this reason she often does not distinguish it from oral prayer (c. 24). She prefers to dwell, however, on the application of the soul to Our Lord and His mysteries (c. 24-26) and such, to her mind, is the best way of practising that active *recollection* which she recommends to those who are unable to meditate (c. 26). Meditation is sometimes rewarded with *sensible consolations*2; but it is also *rich in trials* and dryness of soul. The saint therefore asks for great *courage* from those who would enter on the way of prayer 3.

Saint Teresa treats of active prayer when speaking of beginners who can and should practise it. It does not follow, however, that contemplatives should never have recourse to it4. On the contrary; she explicitly affirms, despite contradiction, that they should practise a *meditation* 5 that is *contemplative* in tendency and well calculated to dispose the soul to a higher grace 6, even to one wholly infused.

She explains this teaching when treating of the human nature of Our Lord and goes on to generalise it by speaking of the application of the mind to the examples given by Our Lady anc the saints7. She is aware, however that the perfect are not able to meditate discursively as in the first stages 8, yet they can "*consider the truths* that the understanding presents to the memory"9; or "dwell on the mysteries" and "call them often to mind, especially at the times they are celebrated by the Church",0. The perfect soul is touched "with the *appearance alone* of Our Lord" ". "With a *simple regard* it considers the grandeur of Him Who suffers" ", in the Passion. Life is full of troubles : "to support them adequately we have need *to consider* how Jesus Christ, our model, and His apostles and saints have supported them"*3. This application of the mind is a necessary exercise and far from being a hindrance to infused prayer, on the contrary leads to it. The saint was thinking especially of the consideration of the human nature *of* the Saviour without which it seemed to her impossible to advance beyond the vth mansion u. She nevertheless admitted the utility of seeking God in His creation as did St. Augustine in his *Confessions*'s. Moreover, in this active exercise, particularly touching the Passion of the Saviour'6,

l *Ibid.,* ist-iind M. — 2 *Ibid.,* tird M., c. 2; ivth M., c. 12.

3 *Ibid.,* mrd M., c. I. Cf. *Life,* c. II, 13; *Way,* c. 20, 21, 23.

4 Paragraph modelled on the *Castle,* Vlth M., c. 7 (on the part of Christ's humanity). Same teaching in *Life,* c. 22 (entire).

5 She refuses to admit that the contemplative "should no longer *meditate* on the mysteries". *Castle,* vith M., c. 7. This meditation completes and perfects active recollection. *Way, c.* 26.

6 *Ibid.* — 7 *Ibid.* — 8 *Ibid.* — 9 *Ibid.*

10 *Ibid.* — " *Ibid.* — 13 *Ibid.* — 13 *Ibid.*

'4 *Ibid.* — '5 *Ibid.*

16 " No, I do not agree that it (the soul) should not often practise it". *Ibid.*

the contemplative soul possesses nobler graces: "It then understands these mysteries in a more perfect way'". Thus, the graces previously obtained remain to simplify the operation of the mind and to excite the will'. Contemplative meditation remains *imperfect* as long as "the fire of love is not kindled in the will and the presence of God is not perceived"[1]. Its *perfection* consists in arriving at this result in *purely infused prayer.* Il may also attain perfection in itself by means of the awareness cf God afforded by contemplation ; this takes place particularly in transformed souls [4]5

3. This active prayer of the perfect is thus extremely mystical both in inspiration and tendency [5]; this element is to be found in all the Saint's ascetic teaching; to suppress it would render her work incomprehensible. In her opinion the mystical graces are offered to all, and form the normal complement to asceticism, necessary for the attainment of perfection and holiness. She affirms this in principle, but with practical reservations.

In her first chapters on prayer, in the *Way*[6], she repeats more than once that God calls to this state — with possible exceptions — all souls, and sometimes even souls " in a poor state " [though in a state of grace]. Contemplation, no doubt, is not necessary for salvation, nor even for perfection, as regards *its essentials;* all souls are not called thereto *defacto:* there are many roads leading to God (c. 17). All Carmelites nevertheless, must prepare themselves for perfection, trusting implicitly in God, Who alone can vouchsafe it (c. 18). Contemplation is a heavenly stream that purifies, refreshes and slakes the thirst (c. 19) and God puts it within reach of all : " The Lord invites everyone". The saint points out (c. 20) that this does not gainsay what she has previously said, "in order *to console* those souls that never come to contemplation ".

The same teaching is found in the Interior Castle. At the Hird mansion, referring to virtuous *persons living in the world,* she states : " There is nothing, it seems, to prevent these souls from finding their way to the final mansion. In fact, ***if they will if*** the Lord will not deny them entrance"[7]. St. Teresa, therefore, holds that not only religious but also ordinary layfolk are called to the higher mystical graces, even before they have experienced any at all. At the vth mansion she begins by affirming that a l Carmelites are "called to prayer and contemplation"[8]. She nevertheless avows that in practice not every

1 *Ibid.*

- This is hardly needful in the vnth M., but may be until then. *Ibid.*

3 *Ibid-*

4 In the transforming union contemplation is constant; the influence of the awareness of God must be especially evident therein when the soul applies itself to the "consideration " of God and divine things. The saint does not use the expression *active contemplation* but she lays down the principles of the doctrine in this matter by teaching contemplatives to "meditate" and "consider" the mysteries. We put aside the expression *acquired* contemplation which is not applicable to the higher forms of meditation of which we speak.

5 Same character "in St. John of the Cross. See foil, chap., p. 831, 837.

6 *Way,* c. 16-20. — 7 *Castle* inrd M., c. 1. — 8 *Ibid.,* vth M., c. 1.

one receives "favours as supernatural" as the union that is treated at this point and that there exists another "way", longer and much more laborious, by which the essentials *of* the union may be attained without "suspension of the faculties". "This fact is indisputable" and "it is well not to banish hope" from souls who have not received the gifts in question*. It is patent from the expressions employed and all the context, that to St. Teresa's mind this latter way is an exceptional way of attaining union 3. She has recourse to it for very practical reasons; to console, to excite renunciation and effort, and to forestall presumption3. At this juncture however, she speaks only of the first degree of union, which lies far below the highest summits of holiness4.

B). St. Teresa's mysticism in general.

I. Her treatises on the mystical graces enabled St. Teresa to wield within the Church an influence possibly never equalled by any other woman and which puts her among the ranks of the greatest teachers of spirituality. Her greatest glory is to have given us a methodical and almost complete series of passive prayers. Her division has become classical. She describes each one separately in a way that determines them almost definitively and allows of their easy recognition. St. John of the Cross was mainly absorbed by the transforming union and judged everything that was inferior in relation to it; such a method inspired him with profound and practical concepts but led him to insist almost exclusively on the purifying function of the passive prayers that precede the transforming union 5. St. Teresa, on the contrary, dwells on each prayer, considers its merits and, as it were, describes it for its own sake, delighted to see God gradually entering into possession of the soul and manifesting His presence in a very special way, right from the outset.

1 *Ibid.,* c. 3.

3 Even more so must this be admitted if we adopt the probable opinion of those who consider the expression "favours *as* supernatural" to allude to ecstatic graces, distinct from graces that are not so extraordinary though nevertheless mystical. See A. Saudreau, *La Vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 261.

3 In the same way she advises, in the ivth M.» that nothing be done with a view to producing mystical prayer directly (c. 2):

4 Various authors stress in a greater measure these reservations of the great Carmelite and conclude that she thinks the greatest holiness to be attainable without mystical graces and that such is the normal path of holiness. We are of the opinion, however, that this interpretation gives to incidental remarks and practical counsels a value of "thesis" that obviously outruns their real meaning, particularly as it is in contradiction to the central thesis developed throughout all Teresa's works.

5 1 his special viewpoint explains the obvious differences between his work and St. Teresa's.

Two groups must be distinguished in the series *of* prayers she describes. All possess a close relation to union with God and the unitive way : though the highest alone may be called prayers of union, the others lead directly to them.

The prayers that come before union are (infused) recollection, quietude, and the sleep of the faculties. In the *Life*[1] the Saint had begun by distinguishing "quietude" and "the sleep of the faculties" as two very special degrees of passive prayer and had said nothing of "recollection". In the *Way*[3] on the contrary "recollection" and "quietude" are the only prayers mentioned as leading to union and these two are clearly separated. In the *Castle*[5] "recollection" is still retained, but is linked up with "quietude". Properly to understand Teresa's teaching it would seem necessary to retain all three, considering them as parts or varieties of the same prayer.

The prayers of union mentioned by St. Teresa are three in number according to the *Castle*[*] : simple union, intense union, transforming union. She did not, however, invariably adopt this strict classification. Thus, the "simple union" and the "intense union" differ but little in the *Life* and in the *Way*[5], and even in the *Castle* the Saint declares that "all that has to do with these two mansions (vth-vith) is almost identical "[6]. Nevertheless, later in the work she brings the vith mansion more in line with the Vlith, saying that she could "have joined them together "[7]. It would seem that the best way of reconciling these affirmations is to look upon the Vith mansion as a group of transitory graces of great intensity which according to the viewpoint adopted may be connected either to the state characterised by the vth mansion of which they form the last and most precious jewel, or to that *of* the Vlith to which they immediately lead the soul[8]. "The transforming union " which is described only in the *Castle*[9], characterises the state of the soul when it has arrived at the most intense pitch of supernatural life that is possible in this life.

2. The principal sources for St. Teresa's teaching on prayer are the three following treatises :

1. Her *Life written by herself,* c. 11-22;
2. The *Way of Perfection,* c. 21-32;
3. Lastly, the whole of the *Interior Castle* [10].

[1] *Life,* c. 14-15 (quietude, 2nd water), 16-17 (sleep of the faculties, 3rd water.)
[3] *Way,* c. 28-29 (Recollection), c. 30-31 (quietude).
[3] *Castle,* ivth. M., c. 1.3, recollection and quietude. — [4] *Ibid.,* vth M.
[5] *Life,* c. 18-22 (Union, 4th water comprising the ecstatic union, c. 20), *Way, c.* 32.
[6] *Castle,* Vth. M., c. 2. — [7] *Ibid.,* vith M., c. 4.
[8] According lo the *Life* and the *Way,* the same degree of union corresponds to the vth and vith M. The parallelism to the passive night of the mind (in the strict sense) of St. John of the Cross confirms this point of view. See below, p. 838.
[9] *Castle,* Vlith M. The other works were written by the saint before she had received this grace (1572).
[10] See above, analysis of the treatises.

In her explanation Teresa combines all that touches the degrees of perfection \ i. e., prayer in general, active prayer and the passive prayers. The schema given here should enable the reader to distinguish all these elements and to find the parallel passages concerning each point. Another schema placed at the end of the following chapter (p. 840) will shew the parallelism that exists between the doctrinal explanations of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, not so much as concerns the prayers (their methods on this point are somewhat divergent) but as regards the higher degrees of the spiritual life.

Ways		Active prayers	Passive prayers
Purgative		*Castle,* 1st and Ilnd Mans.	
Illuminative	A	*(Life,* c. 11-13. *Way,* c. 21-26. { *Castle,* 11rd Mans. (affective meditation)	
	B	Same texts as for A. See especially *Way,* 26. (Active recollection)	*Life,* c. 14-15 (Quietude) c. 16-17 (sleep of fac.) *Way,* c. 28-29 (Recollection) c. 30-31 (Quietude) *Castle,* ivth M., c. 1-3 (Recollection and quietude)
Unitive	.	\ *Life,* c. 22. \ *Castle,* vith M., c. 7. (Contemplative meditation [1])	*Life,* c. 18-21 (Infused union) *Way,* c. 32 (id.) *Castle,* vth M. (Simple union) vith M. (Intense union)
	B	*Castle,* vilth M. (Perf. contemp. med.[3])	*Castle,* vilth M. (transforming union).

In the following explanation of the passive prayers we shall insist, as does the Saint, on their importance to the

[1] See above, p. 810. — [3] Sec above, p. 812.
[3] See, p. S12 and p. 823.

union *, and this particularly as regards the higher degrees. We must not, however, neglect the great place that is given to the knowledge of God, as well as to love. It is extremely remarkable that for St. Teresa the advance towards the perfect love of God is at the same time *an advance to greater understanding of God.* The will alone is uplifted in the prayers that precede the union : like the arid quietude of St. John of the Cross2, the sweet quietude of St. Teresa is undoubtedly and with even better reason to be explained by a secret contemplation, which though real, is, as it were, implicit, becoming explicit in the passive union when the Vth mansion is attained. Here the mind itself is ravished and God is " seen " in some way (without the operation of the understanding). The same is to be said of the vith Mansion, and one of the Saint's criteria of the supernatural reality of the ravishments is that they contain some manifestation of the truth. Among the highest favours, she mentions a more lively understanding of various truths 3. In the Vllth Mansion the light becomes softer and at the same time more penetrating, for the soul, since it first received the graces of union, has become more accustomed " to the understanding of pure truth " 4. Furthermore, all these graces have their end in charity, though they are distinct from it; thus contemplatives, temporarily deprived of the awareness of " the presence of God " produced by the " fire of love " 5, nevertheless possess a deep and acute understanding of the mysteries, as a result of enlightenment that they have already received and which may aid them to receive still more in the course of fresh infused graces. In the latter, the two intellectual and affective elements co-exist in some sort and the saint seems to underline the latter by her insistence on the suavity of supernatural quietude and even more on the prayers of union.

C) The mystical graces that prepare the union.

These graces in general act directly on the will alone. Quietude is the chief of these graces, but it is introduced by infused recollection and may be found in the higher form of the sleep of the faculties.

* See above, the place of charity in this spirituality, p. 810.
3 See below, p. 836. — 3 *Castle,* vith M., c. 10.
♦ *Life,* c. 21. — 5 *Castle,* vith M., c. 7.

I. Unlike *active* recollection in which the soul makes an effort to apply its faculties (senses, imagination, memory, mind) to a pious subject, in passive recollection[1] (given by God), the faculties retire on themselves, as sheep enter the fold at the call of the shepherd; bees returning to the hive and the tortoise and the hedgehog withdrawing themselves are other symbols of the same grace[2]. God thus calls upon the soul, not indeed to arrest all the mind's activity, but to apply itself calmly to interior things without violence and confusion. At this point already the soul " touches the supernatural" [3]. Quietude has begun.

2. Quietude [4] is characterised by a deep peacefulness accompanied by a delicious joy that invades the soul, or at least the will, and gives it supernatural rest, restores its spiritual strength and expands its love. Therein the soul savours in some way the sweetness of God : hence the name of *spiritual tastes* that the Saint gives to this prayer. "The will alone is captive here" [5]; the other faculties occasionally share in the banquet; at other times they cause disorder, especially the imagination. The soul must then refrain from much thought and turn all its endeavours to loving. Ouietude must not be confused with *sensible consolations* \ These have their source in the active operation of the faculties and always produce some physical uneasiness : with them the soul is like a basin to which, by means of canals, water comes from afar; in *quietude,* on the contrary, " this water flows from our innermost places with an extreme peacefulness, tranquillity and sweetness "[7].

3. The sleep of the faculties described in the *Life* and which is not mentioned again, is given as an intermediary prayer between quietude and union[8]. In some passages it is described as a " very manifest union of the whole soul with God"[9]. No doubt the will alone is truly "bound and immersed in joy" [10] with a kind of intimate exaltation, delight in God and a feeling of the vanity of this world;[11] but the understanding and the memory, and sometimes the imagination, have some part in it; they are filled with peace even in their application to exterior works and

1 *Life,* c. 14; *Way,* c. 28-29; *Castle,* ivth M., c. 3.

2 St. Francis of Sales *{Love of God.,* vi, c. 7) adds to these comparisons that of the magnet, at the approach of which all the needles turn their points inwards : thus does God do to the faculties.

3 *Life,* c. 14.

4 *Life,* c. 14-15; *Way,* c. 30-31; *Castle,* ivth M.» c. 1-3.

5 *Way, ibia'.* —6 *Castle,* ivth M., c. I. *'I Ibid.,* c. 2.

8 It is the third spiritual " water". *Life,* c. 16-17.

9 *Ibid.* — 10 *Ibid.* —- " *Ibid.*

easily combine the part of Martha with that of Mary[1]. St. Francis of Sales considers this prayer as a variety of quietude[2].

Among the Saint's writings on quietude may be found various practical observations, the fruit of her great experience, i. It is a *fairly common prayer,* " many, yes, many souls come to this state" says she, but few go farther, failing to recognise this great grace which is a spark of divine love. It is of the utmost importance to recognise it[3]. 2. Unlike the graces of union of the vth and Vlth Mansions, which have little duration, quietude sometimes *lasts* a long time, days on end. Any attempt to *retain* or *prolong* it by *inaction,* however, are useless: the true means of obtaining it are to think oneself unworthy, to do nothing of oneself to produce it directly, and to busy oneself with the virtues and duties of one's state[4]. 3. Persons of feeble and unhealthy temperament are inclined to let themselves become absorbed by lhe sweet emotions deriving from quietude and *fall into a swoon* for which they themselves are responsible and which they wrongly take to be a ravishment. They need sleep and nourishment, less austerity and prayer; and should that be not enough, they must give themselves wholly to the active life[5]. 4. Another danger for souls favoured with these tastes of the divine is to *think themselves very strong* and not to avoid sufficiently the occasions of sin, whereas their weakness is in reality still very great[6].

D) The first graces of union.

Though St. Teresa believes that it is possible to arrive at a true and effective union of the will with God bv means of renunciation and personal effort,[7] without mystical graces of union, it is no less certain that this way[7] is extremely long and its arduousness is greatly[7] relieved by[7] such graces. These are the graces moreover that establish between the Creator and his creature an admirable intimacy, so perfectly reflected in the servants of God. This friendship, which culminates in the transforming union, is prepared by' the graces of simple union which the saint compares to a glimpse of God and by[7] graces of *intense union,* likened to *spiritual espousals*[8][9]

i. The grace of simple union,[9] unlike quietude, is of very[7] short duration. And now, not only[7] is the *will* affected but the *understanding* also is unable to act; its operation is suspended. God deprives the soul of understanding " the better to impress in it true wisdom... God then comes to

[1] *Ibid.,* — [2] *Lave of God,* Vl, c. 8.
[3] *Life,* c. 15. Cf. *Way,* c. 30 (end). — [4] *Castle,* ivth M.» c. 2.
[5] *Ibid,* c. 3. — [6] *IHL* — [7] See above, p. 813.
[8] *Castle,* Vth M.', c. 4.
[9] *Castle,* vth M., c. 1-4· Cf. *Life,* c. 1S-19 and 21; *Way,* c. 32.

dwell in the secret places of the soul in such a manner that when it again comes to itself, it does not doubt it has been in God, and God in it " [1]. The soul then realises that God is "in all beings by His presence, power and essence" [2]. There is nothing physical here; " only the divinity is in question " [3]. The soul sees only in a mysterious manner the One to Whom she is to be espoused. The knowledge that is thus acquired in a short space of time, could not be obtained in a thousand years by the channels of the senses and the faculties " [4]. Even more explicitly St. Teresa declares in the *Life* that the soul in this union is enlightened "with an understanding of the pure truth " [5]. The deep understanding of God peculiar to this perfect contemplation explains certain outstanding features of this grace of union we have just outlined and particularly that certainty which the Saint regards as one of the criteria of true union [6].

This union may also be recognised in its powerful moral consequences : [7] detachment from the world and self become more complete, and more joyful the submission to the Divine will. In the union the soul *dies* to the world in order to *live* for God, as the silkworm encloses itself in its cocoon in order to come forth winged. Altogether transfigured, the soul burns with love for God and desires to suffer for Him, to resemble the crucified Jesus. In addition, the soul is eaten up with the desire to win other souls to Christ and especially to lead them to a life of prayer. Henceforth the soul can work for the good of others without personal danger; [8] its love for God will not fail, provided it remains faithful, for watchfulness and continual effort remain always necessary [9].

2. The graces of intense union [10] increase all these effects and particularly affective union with God, for, although the heavenly splendour that has been revealed to the soul causes it to love as a friend Him Who, despite His grandeur, has shown such condescension, there still remains much to be done before this incipient friendship is transformed into the deepest possible intimacy. In order that the soul may come more speedily heart to heart with God, graces similar to the foregoing are multiplied and grow in intensity, thus manifesting to the soul the very tender affection of God : " Not content with having made this soul one with Him by the union He has entered into with it, He begins to

1 *Cosile,* c. I. — 2 *lbid.* Cf. *Life.* — 3 *Castle.*
4 *Ibid.* — 5 *Life,* c. 21. — 6 *Castle.*
J *Castle,* vtb. M., c. 2-3. — 3 *Life, c.* 19. — 9 *Castle,* vtb M., c. 4.
10 *Castle,* vith M., c. ı-n. Cf. *Life,* c. 20.

converse *familiarly* with it, to reveal His secrets; He delights in showing it what it has gained in giving itself to Him and unveiling something of what He still holds in store" [1].

In the *Vith mansion* St. Teresa describes those spiritual favours by which God led her to the deepest intimacy with Him. She reduces them to four main heads which she recounts with admirable exactitude [2], completing or repeating what she has already said in the *Life* or the *Relations*. They are : *a) interior appeals* to love [3], delicate and subtle movements that spring from the depths of the soul; *b) supernatural words* \ *of* such sovereign efficacy that they may easily be distinguished from those that come from the imagination and the devil ; *c) ravishments*^ by means of which, above all, is contracted that closer union with God which the Saint compares to a betrothal. Their usual form is *ecstasy* [6], and sudden and close union with God (occasioned, for instance, by a word overheard or remembered) in the course of which lofty truths concerning the greatness of God are impressed on the soul (swooning or loss of sensation render this ravishment doubtful) ". The *flight of the spirit** is a violent and impetuous ravishment which produces the same effects more forcefully in the soul ; wonder at the divine grandeur, humility, detachment, desire *of* suffering, and death, spiritual jubilation. *d)* Finally, *visions* sometimes accompany these ravishments; they may also take place apart and are either *imaginative** or *intellectual* [10].* About 1560 Teresa saw in imagination her heart pierced by an angel". In an intellectual vision she understood that all things are in God and that God is Truth [12]. *Our Lord* especially reveals Himself thus, both imaginatively and intellectually. Of special import is the grace by which He reveals His presence to a soul, a grace that may last for a whole year [*3]. Yet even the most magnificent visions are *inferior to ravishments* and these are but graces of intense union; the intensity is expressed in a violence which is really a weakness, destined to disappear [*4]. The Saint is careful to point out that several of these favours are *exceptional;* they should not, therefore, be desired [*5], save for the spiritual effects they produce in the soul.

It should be sedulously remarked that St. Teresa, having led souls almost to the apex of perfection, stresses their need to increase their love of the human nature of Our Lord. She devotes two beautiful chapters to this subject in the Zz/t'and the *Castle* [1*]. Without Our Lord, one can scarcely go beyond simple union [17] : it is He Who holds the keys to close friendship with God and He also who especially gives understanding of the graces received in contemplation. Thus is born that spiritual love of which St. Bernard speaks. Yet even at this point the Saint does not want the soul to await everything from above. She recalls the need *of rising up* to God by means of various considerations beginning with created things and especially Our Lord [18].

* *Way,* c. 32. — 2 *Castle,* vith M c. 9. — 3 *Ibid., c.* 2.
4 *Ibid.,* c. 3. — 5 /¿A/., c'. 4-8. — 6 *Ibid.,* c. 4. — 7 *Ibid.*
8 *Ibid.,* c. 5-6. — 9 *Ibid., c.* 8. — 10 *Ibid.,* c. 9. *" life,* c. 29.
12 *Castle,* Vith M., c. 10. — *3 *lbid.,c.* <S.
14 *Ibid,* c. 8-10; viith M.» c. 3. — *Ibid,* vith M., c. 9.
16 *Life* c. 22; *Castle,* vith M., c. 7· — 7 *d.ife, ibid.* — See above, p. 81

While God is lowering Himself in order to reveal Himself to the soul, and raising the latter by kindling its love, He also *purifies* it in order to render it more worthy of His friendship. Great trials go hand in hand with all the graces we have mentioned. The sight of divine immensity humiliates and frees the soul, breaks up all human attachments and leads it on unceasingly to the accomplishment of fresh sacrifices. Other trials come from without :1 criticism, the trial of praise "more acute than the former", illnesses, interior trials, misunderstanding on the part of confessors and even diabolical interference. Lastly 2, the desire of seeing God, or the trial of feeling forsaken, which the saint compares to purgatory. These last *purifications of the soul* which lead to the Vllth mansion are especially described by St. John of the Cross 3.

E) The transforming union 4. Perfect divine friendship.

All these efforts, all these graces, all these trials finally lead the soul to the highest possible union with God in this world, *a)* God now reveals Himself, as much as is possible to a created being in this world. The direct object of the divine light is no longer, as it was in the vth mansion, the *divinity* alone. The *three divine Persons* communicate themselves directly to the soul "in a certain representation of the truth" 5. The soul perceives clearly that They dwell within it and will never depart. The *second Person* contracts a particularly close union 6 (because of the special bonds that unite Him with us) watching over the soul, whilst the soul in its turn promises to seek only His glory. This union is the result of a very perfect contemplation. It took place for St. Teresa in several exceptional circumstances 7. *b)* Henceforth this contemplation or intellectual vision of the Trinity, or of our Lord, takes place *in the depths oj the soul*3,# without the direct participation of the senses or the imagination. Yet these faculties are not turned away from the divine banquet. In preceding unions their oper-

1 *Castle,* Vlth M., c. I. — 3 *Ibid.,* c. n.

i "Passive night of the mind *Cf. Dark Night, c.* II. See below, p. 839.

4 *Casta,* viuh M., c. 1-4. — * *Ibid., c.* 1. — 6 *Ibid.,* c. 2.

Notably the imaginative vision of Our Lord, according to *Relation* 23. *Œuvres,* vol. 11, p. 246.

8 *Castle, ibid.,* c. 2.

ations were suspended; here, God causes "the scales to fall from the eyes of the soul so that it may contemplate and understand in some extraordinary way something of the favour He vouchsafes it" L

The manifold effects of this grace are a prodigy of lower and simplicity. *Peace* and *delight* transcend all that las gone before, for the union is more perfect. "The soul, or rather the spirit of the soul, becomes as far as one may see, one with God..."2. This union is like that of two candles, so near to each other that they give but one light as if from one flame. Now are exemplified the words of St. Paul : *Qui adhœret Domino unus spiritus est (I Cor.,* VI, 17). The hidden activities of the soul are wholly divine : a "brilliant light" comes "from within it... to enlighten its *faculties* hence derives a marvellous force "giving life to its new life" 3. From now on *forgetfulness of self* is perfected and the soul is completely detached; the desire of going to God is moderated by one of suffering and working for Him; there are no more violent ravishments but only an unchanging peacefulness and rest, even in the midst of trials and work ». Such are, in general, the consequences of the divine embrace.

1'he permanency of this union, compared by St. Teresa to that of husband and wife in *marriage*^ is another of its qualities5. It is permanent not only as regards the *effects* produced, but also with respect to the very *grace* that causes it, that deep divine *contemplation* which is maintained *continuously,* in the sense that the soul has but to stay its activity in order to find itself in the presence of God. This presence does not always possess the "same degree of clarity", but as soon as the soul becomes attentive it sees itself with God and in God6. The faculties and the senses may still be troubled at times; " the spirit of the soul" remains in deep peace together with its God7.

Lastly, and this is not less remarkable than what has gone before, a powerful activity crowns the divine work and the Saint ends8 a work devoted to *passive graces* with pressing appeals to action. The purpose of these graces is not to make sensible the divine embraces, but to strengthen souls that they may be able to suffer with Our Lord and bring forth works for His glory: "*Works,* I repeat, there is the true sign of God's operation and a gift from His hand"9. The soul that is united to God "forbids all idleness to the faculties, to the senses, and all that concerns the body"; moreover "there is no doubt that this soul, having become one and the same with the strong God, by this sovereign union of spirit to spirit, shares in His *strength* ,10 and His vigour makes

' *Ibid,* c I. — 3 *Ibid.,* c. 2. – 3 *Ibid.,* c. 2 and 4. — " *Ibid.,* c. 3.
5 *¡bid.* — *(Ibid.* — *'I Ibid.,* Cf. *Ascent of Carmel,* Π, c. 5.
8 *Castle, ibid.,* c. 4· " 9 rbid· " '0 M

itself felt even in the body itself... The freedom the soul enjoys and the spiritual energy it draws from this divine intimacy enable it to exercise a *perfect activity.* Martha and Mary are thus united at last and each gives herself up to her own task under the eyes of Christ'. The Divine friendship is as indissoluble and fertile as that of marriage. St. Teresa, far from conceiving the union as a blotting out of the soul in God, regards it as the source of its greatest activity, both interior and exterior, *in* God, *with* God and *for* God.

The soul comes to this happy consummation only by means of a constant advance towards wisdom, *towards thefullest supernatural light,* an advance that runs parallel to that of the love of God [23] This strong and untroubled light is no other than that "*understanding ofpure truth" of* which the Saint already wrote concerning the first graces of union, an understanding, which having now become yet more simple and powerful by the operation of the Holy Ghost, suffices to enlighten the *faith,* kindle *charity* and stimulate perfect *action.* Here the virgin of Avila makes common cause with the great Doctor of Hippo. No matter how different the courses they set, their mystical souls led them to the same harbour.

CHAPTER IX.

Saint John of the Cross.

Special Bibliography :

Editions: the first dates from 1618 : the last is that of Fr. Gerardo DE San Juan de la Cruz, *Obras del mistico doctor San Juan de la C.,* Toledo, 1912 (vol. I-II), 1914 (vol. III) better than all previous ones but still imperfect. Recent French translations : CARMELITES DE Paris, Poitiers, 1880, 1910; H. HOORNAERT on Fr. Gerardo's edition, 2nd ed., 1922 (vol. Mi), 1924 (vol. ni-iv).

Studies: Lives: Fr Jerome de S. Joseph, Introd, to the trans., of the Carmelites of P., vol. I, p. 3-303. Demimuid, *S. Jean de la* C, (Coll. *Les Saints)* Paris, 1916 (3rd ed.). R. Hoornaert, *Dâme ardente de S. J. de la C.,* Paris-Bruges, 1924. Fr. Bruno, *S. Jean de la C.,* Paris, 1929. Short life and description in *Vie Spirituelle,* May 1927 (see infra). Doctrine and works : Berthier, S. J., *Analyse sommaire en onze lettres.* Besançon, 1846. A. Poulain S. J., *La mystique de S. J. de la C.,* Paris, 1893. Ludovic de Besse, O. F. M. Cap., *Eclaircissement sur les œuvres mystiques de S. J. de la C.,* Paris 1893. Wenceslas

[1] *Ibid.* — [2] See above, p. 810.

du S. Sacrement, *Fisionomia de un Doctor,* Salamanca, 1913, 2 vols. R. Garrigou-La Grange, *Perf chrét. et contemplation selon S. Thomas et S. J. de la C.,* S. Maximin, 1923. Mgr Landrieux, *Sur les pas de S.J. de la C.,* Paris, 1924. A. Saudreau, in *La vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 278-288. P. Pourrai', *La spiritualité chrétienne,* ni, 1925, p. 278-308. F. Pascal du S. Sacrement, *St Jean de la C., (Saint),* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 767-787. *Vie spirituelle,* 1927 (vol. XVI) gives all the May number, p. 141-329 to St. John of the C. : articles on his life (p. 141-174; ; ascetic teaching, p. 175-190, by Dom Chevallier); the night of the mind (p. 197-222, by GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE); the transforming union (p. 223-254, by Fr. GABRIEL de Ste M.); contemplation and action (p. 255-301) : the director of souls (p. 302-329). The extremely well documented studies of J. Baruzi are to be read with great caution as regards the doctrinal viewpoint '.

I. — LIFE (1542-1591) AND WORKS.

I. The interior life of St. John of Cross can scarce be understood if it is separated from a study of his exterior life. The latter illustrates how closely he was associated with St. Teresa's activity and how greatly she influenced him; it throws great light, moreover, on his doctrinal work which consists in part of a systematisation of his personal experiences. It has been found possible to divide his life of 49 years " into three periods : 1. a period of preparation, while he awaited the light; 2. a period of ascents and achievement in solitude, once the light had been vouchsafed; 3. a period of external activity by means of his writings and labours"[2].

Little is known of the first period. John of Yepes was born at Fontiberos (Old Castile) in 1542, of a noble but impoverished family. As a youth he turned his hand to various trades (weaver, carpenter, sculptor) went on to a sound education in grammar and the humanities in a Jesuit college at Medina (1556-1562) and shortly after joined the Carmelite Fathers in that town. When he had finished his noviciate he was sent to Salamanca to study theology (1564-1568).

[1] Jean Baruzi, *S'. Jean de la C., et le problème de Vexpérience mystique,* Paris, 1924 (critical, biographical and literary study and "doctrinal synthesis"); *Aphorismes de S. Jean de la C.,* Paris 1924 (Texts and exegesis, summarising the doctrine). According to M. Baruzi, St. John of the C., advances and leads his disciple, unconsciously perhaps, but very certainly to union with a "God without modality" *(Experience,* p. 573) by means of "a return to nature" *(Aph.,* p. 59, 63) by the " universalisation of the intellect " *(Exp.,* p. 110) by the annihilation of seif and the " desire of ruin " (p. 464). The author " transposes " the theology and mysticism of St. John into a special "metaphysics" and a new theodocy, that of " intellectualist idealism ", and thinks his interior life to be near enough to the "essential Protestant attitude" *(Aph.* p. 37). See Dom CHEVALLIER, *Vie spir.,* 1925 (v°l. XII)» P. (188-212).

[3] *Vie spirit., num. cit.,* 1927, p. 142.

He followed the University course. He was ordained priest in 1567 at Medina and had occasion to talk with St. Teresa who confided in him her plans for a reform of the Carmelite monasteries. He was immediately won over to this enterprise which fell in exactly with his own desires for a more perfect manner of life. The project was swiftly carried out.

In the following year the young priest was already making rapid progress in the ways of sanctity, a progress which led him in ten years to the highest peaks. In 1568, with the permission of the superior general, a noviciate of the reform was opened at Durvelo. To this house was assigned, together with the prior of Medina, Fr. John of Saint Mathias, henceforth known as *Fr. John of the Cross.* Both here and in the noviciates that took its place his special charge was the training of the novices, and later in the colleges, the students of the Order. This function, though apparently humble, was extremely important in reality. Ide was named confessor of the Carmelites of the Incarnation at Avila in May 1572, probably at St. Teresa's request, and remained there until 157/. During this period he made great progress at the school of Teresa whose " director " and confessor he was, and who at the end of this year 1572 had been granted the grace of transforming union,

During these years of retirement, "the war of the moderates", troubled the Order in Spain, without however perturbing John of the Cross. But in 1577, during the night of December 3rd, he was torn away from his solitude and taken to Toledo where he was thrown into a monastic prison for seven months by order of superiors of the moderates. The physical and moral sufferings he bore, combined with spiritual trials, completed the purification of his soul and brought him in his turn to the transforming union. It was then he wrote the inspired verses of the canticle which he comments in several of his works.

After his liberation and the setting up of a reformed province, Fr. John of the Cross was successively rector of the theological college at Baeza (1579-1581), prior of Granada, (1581-1585) vicar-provincial (1585-1587), and again prior of Granada(1587-1588),and then of Segovia(i 588-1591).

He never occupied a prominent position either because he was too much taken up by his interior life to give the necessary attention to administrative matters, or because men who were more brilliant, even in a worldly sense, and who had been won over to the reform by St. Teresa, were judged to be more capable of undertaking the delicate negotiations that were necessary. In 1588, however, he became a member of the Curia *{Consulta}* established by the first general, Fr. Doria, but he was removed from all office in the middle of 1591 by this authoritarian superior whose idea of reform differed from those who had begun it. St. John ot the Cross died at the end of this same year

as a simple religious in disgrace in an Andalusian monastery at Ubeda (Dec. 14th. 1591). His constant prayer "to suffer and be despised" was heard. His life was an illustration of the teaching he sets forth in his works.

2. The writings of St. John of the Cross were for a long period known only to members of the Carmelite order. Since their publication in 1618, however, they have assured throughout the Church his doctrinal authority, recognised by his canonisation in 1726 and solemnly proclaimed in 1927 by Pius XI who created him a Doctor. His main works are the *Ascent of Mount Carniel* and the *Dark Night of the Soul* which both explain some verses known only from the first line: " In a dark night with anxious love inflamed..." (T579-1583). The remaining two, written about 1584, the *Living blame of Love,* and the *Spiritual Canticle* are also commentaries of two poems, the first consisting of 4 stanzas and the other of 40. These works differ from the two previously mentioned both as regards their subject and the manner of explanation, but also form a complement to them even though this, perhaps, may not have been the author's intention [1].

The Ascent of Mount Carmel has for its subject in general the *active* purification [2] of the soul; a number of passages, however, refer to passive elements, treated elsewhere [3].

The first book deals with the "*the active—dark night-—of the* senses", i. e., of the sensitive soul : after some general data on the nights (c. 1-3) the author explains at length the need of mortifying lhe passions which hinder the Spirit of God (c. 4-5), and cause much harm to the soul: tiredness (c. 6), suffering (c. 7) blindness (c. 3) impurity (c. 9) lukewarmness (c. 10). Souls therefore must be urged to mortification (c. 11-12) and the blessed Doctor sets out a magnificent project of asceticism (c. 13). Conclusion (c. 14-15).

Books II and in deal with the "*active—dark night—of the* mind" i. e., of the soul considered in its rational part which comprises the *understandings* the *memory*[4] and the *will.* Each of these faculties

[1] Also attributed to him is a *treatise on the thorns of the soul* (talks by Christ to his Church) and another on *the dark knowledge of God.* To these must be added various *ofúscala,* and especially the *Additions* to the first instruction printed for the novices. These writings add little to the other four undoubtedly authentic writings.

[2] *Night* usually means *purification.* For other meanings see below, p. 833.

[3] Especially in the *Dark Night.*

[4] Memory is distinguished from the understanding as a special operation rather than as a separate faculty.

is purified respectively by *faith,* hope and charity'. Book II treats mainly of the purification *of* the understanding by*faith:* the author first explains the *reasons* and benefits of purification (c. i-8) shewing particularly that faith, despite its obscurity, is the only proportionate and proximate means *of* attaining union with God (c. 8). In practice, he counsels a faith simplified by renunciation of the knowledge received by the external senses, i. e., various images and perceptions (c. 9-11) and he even applies these principles to discursive meditation which should be given up by some souls (c. 12-13) Perfect faith, if it would lead to union, must even incline the soul to detach itself from certain distinct knowledge of a *supernatural nature,* not only imaginative visions (c. 14-20) but also purely spiritual perceptions (c. 21-30): intellectual visions (22), revelations (23-25), interior words (27-29), spiritual feelings (30). MEMORY is purified by *hope* (bk. Ili, c. 1-14) which, having an absolutely transcendent object, exacts a complete renunciation of natural (c. 1-5) and supernatural imaginative perceptions (c. 6-12) and even special spiritual understanding (c. 13). His great axiom is that the soul must empty itself of self in order to be filled with God (c. 14). *Charity* unites the will to God, but first it purifies it (bk. ill, c. 15-44) for the object proper to this virtue is perfect Good, in which alone *joy* is to be sought (c. 16)[2] by turning away from other particular natural[3] and even supernatural good (c. 17-28) [4]. Each point is studied with marvellous subtility. The text ends suddenly in the midst of a development. It may be wondered if it was ever written or if it has been lost[5].

The Dark Night has for its general object the *passive* purifications the soul must undergo while it is also actively purifying itself so as to attain to perfect union.

The first is the passive night of the senses, treated in book 1. The better to shew its need, St. John of the Cross acutely and finely analyses the *imperfections* of pious and even perfect souls. In general, these are natural tendencies which mingle with the best acts of devotion (c. 1) and may be reduced to subtle forms of pride (complacency, desire of being esteemed etc.) (c. 2) greed (misuse of pious objects) (c. 3), impurity (disorderly movements of the flesh) (c. 4), anger (irritability during times of aridity) (c. 5), gluttony (desire of consolation, excesses

1 For the function of these three virtues, see the general explanation in *Ascent,* II, c. 5, and summary at the end of the *Night,* 11, c. 21 (end).

2 Joy is one of the 4 passions (joy, hope, sorrow, fear) that St. John says must be ruled with care *(Ascent,* I, c. 13; see below, p. 835). His intention was to shew the part played by charity with regard to these four *(Ascent,* ill, c. 15). The extant text deals with joy alone *(ibid.,* c. 16-44) an(l even the end of this explanation is lacking.

3 Temporal goods (wealth, position), 17-19; natural goods (of the body and soul), 20-22; sensitive goods (concerning the 5 senses), 23-25: moral goods (natural virtues, etc.), 26 28.

4 Extraordinary (graces *gratis data),* 29-31 ; spiritual goods in general, in the right meaning of the term (32-33) in particular the objects of worship (called emotive goods), c. 34-43, preaching (provocative goods), c. 44. The text omits the *directive* and *perfective* goods he was to have treated (c. 32).

3 See II. Hoornaert, *Ascent,* II, p. no.

in pious practices) (c. 6) jealousy towards more virtuous souls (c. 7) natural inertia and idleness in trials *(ibid.).* To reveal these faults, unperceived for the most part, and uproot them, God sends the *supernatural trial* termed the passive night of the senses (c. 8-10) whose effects are admirable (c. 11-14)'.

Book π (25 chapters) deals with the passive night of the mind. The first four chapters afford a *general outline of* the teaching : state of souls who have passed through the night of the senses (c. I), their *imperfections* (c. 2), the *nature* of this fresh trial (c. 3) and its *effects* (c. 4). The following chapters explain at length the nature of this trial (c. 5-18) and describe its effects (c. 19-25)[1]. These divisions, however, should not be taken too strictly, for the author constantly points out, with reference to sufferings that are borne and graces received, the spiritual benefits that must accrue to the soul, especially the interior renewal which submits the whole man thus transformed to the action of grace[3,4]

The Living Flame of Love is an eloquent, enthusiastic and even lyrical commentary of four stanzas of verse 4 expressing the feelings of a soul which has arrived at the transforming union. The work is a contemplation rather than a treatise and is therefore not easy to analyse. The 1st stanza expresses the desire of eternal union by a soul burning with the love of God, wounded to death by love, Ihe 2nd describes the effects of this love, symbolised by a cautery, a wound, a touch, a hand. The 3rd sings the tokens of love given to the Well-Beloved, and the 4th tells of the indescribable rewards given by God to the soul that is united to Him. Though not didactic, this writing finely interprets the state of transformed souls.

1 he Spiritual Canticle similarly comments the 40 stanzas of a poem in dialogue partly written during his imprisonment at Toledo. The commentary, begun after his liberation and finally completed about 1584 at the request of the prioress of the Carmelites of Beas, Anne of Jesus, also treats of the mystical union : first, the necessary dispositions, then the " spiritual espousals " that form its proximate preparation, and lastly the union itself or the spiritual marriage 5.

1 See below, doctrinal explanation, p. 837.

2 See below, p. 839.

3 See p. 839 sq.

4 See *Did. théol., art. cit.,* col. 7S1-7^3·

s Fr. Gerardo in bis critical edition considers the commentary of the *Living Flameas* the last part of the *Ascent of Mount Carmel* which was to have treated of the unitive way (transforming union). He looked upon the *Canticle* as a summary of the three works.

II. MYSTICAL DOCTRINE.

A). The Point of View of St. John of the Cross.

St. John of the Cross is above all a mystical Doctor. He writes exclusively for souls already advanced in virtue, with a desire to help them to correspond to the eminent graces that are meant to lead them to perfection. Like St. Teresa, he takes these souls at the very outset of the mystical ways and leads them to the topmost summits. He has a different angle of approach, however, from the great Carmelite; hence a vocabulary and explanations very unlike hers, so much so, that at first blush, the two teachings appear entirely dissimilar. Yet in reality they agree perfectly and the works of the two saints marvellously supplement each other.

Unlike St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross does not describe the entire series of supernatural favours; he prefers to consider them in their essential and fundamental element, contemplation. He conceives the latter as "a general and affectionate attention to God"; "a general and loving knowledge of God"[1]: this, on the one hand is very simple[2], though it enlightens and strengthens faith[3]; on the other hand, it is, as it were, extremely magnetic, and lays violent hold on the will, despite the aridities that it often causes, especially at the outset. Such is the central core of St. John's doctrine: all else is but a regular development, or a theoretical and practical application. Thus, for instance, he does not allow discursive meditation to be abandoned until sure signs of contemplation make their appearance[4]. His reason for urging souls to abandon spiritual images and perceptions is that the essential of the gifts lies elsewhere, i. e., in contemplative knowledge on which they are based[5].

1 *Ascent,* II, c. 12; *Night,* 1, c. 8, sq. ....*.

9 "We should remark that it is a question of a general knowledge. It sometimes shows itself to he so delicate and subtle a thing, especially when it is quite pure, simple and perfect, when it is truly spiritual and interior, that the soul though engaged with it, neither notices nor experiences it". *Ascent,* II, c. 12; See Hoornaert's trans., p. 109.

3 Hence the outstanding importance of this virtue in the spirituality of St. John of the Cross.

* See below, p, S38.

5 See p. 836.

This teaching is the kernel of all his treatises but particularly of the two in which he sets out the purifications which prepare the soul for perfect union: the *Ascent of Mount Carmel* and the *Dark Night.* In these he is wholly preoccupied, as may be supposed, with the negative aspect of contemplation, inasmuch as it is an agent for purifying the soul (first in its sensitive part, and then in its spiritual part). He does not, however, overlook its positive function, illumination and strengthening of the faith.

That contemplation of which we have just written is infused: it is produced by a special operation of the Holy Ghost; it is essentially *mystical,* and in this sense,*passive.* Yet it does not follow that the mystical soul is reduced to a passive inactivity; on the contrary. On the principle he lays down, St. John of the Cross bases a complete *asceticism,* comprising all the "active" purifications that the soul must accomplish in order to pave the way for the "passive" purifications that God inflicts and in order to benefit by them. The asceticism here in question is not exterior; it nevertheless surpasses that of beginners who are still striving with sin; it is a higher asceticism by which fervent souls prepare themselves for the reception of graces which have not hitherto been granted them, and by which souls already enlightened by the first gleams of contemplation correspond to the gifts of God and purify themselves in view of greater enlightenment, until they attain the perfect union. The importance of this viewpoint is extreme, even in the mystical teaching of St. John of the Cross. Failure to understand it makes it difficult to reconcile two elements of St. John's work, which, in reality, supplement each other.

At a date posterior to St. John's writings there was talk of active contemplation and his *ofMount Cannel* was called in evidence. St.John of the Cross does indeed constantly treat of the *activity* that man must call forth in order to dispose his soul for the reception of giace. A large part of his work applies directly to prayer, mainly the whole of book II which deals with the active purification of the soul. This purification of the noblest part of the soul, the mind, the memory and the will is accomplished by the active *exercise offaith, hope, and. charity**. We are now dealing with a more perfect activity than that of beginners. It consists of a series of acts, not difficult of themselves, such as simple looks at God and His perfections, but involving above all a great eftort to clear the mind and memoryot all individual imagesand

1 See above, p. 359·

' See analysis, p. 827.

perceptions * and to purify the affections. This is the method of "negative theology" taught by Dionysius the Areopagite2.

This simplified activity, therefore, is not truly a discursive meditation. The time for such is now over 3, and its place is taken by the more simple exercise dealt with above. This exercise, though active, remains closely linked to infused contemplation. On this St. John is explicit; this simplified activity of faith must not be substituted for meditation save in the measure that contemplative graces have been granted to the adept 4. The simple acts of this faith, which is intuitive rather than discursive, imply', for St. John, not perhaps the actual realisation of true contemplation, but certainly that pure and general knowledge of God which is one of its essential elements and which is partly prolonged, at least in its effects, when the grace of contemplation is withdrawn. In brief, this activity of faith is but one of the forms of purifying asceticism that St. John explains and which not only leads to mysticism but depends on it and implies it.

We may affirm, then, that there is no necessity to classify St. John's spirituality into two parallel ways, one mystical the other ascetic, both leading independently to perfection. *Activity* and *passivity* as mentioned in the two treatises stand not for two separate states but for two aspects of one and the same ways of holiness, two elements perfectly co-ordinated in order to raise the faithful soul to the highest degree of union. This is the transforming union which St. John considers to be the normal consummation of the advance towards perfection6. To his mind it alone characterises the *unitive way.* Consequently7 he gave the name of *illuminative way* to the state of those souls who receive even great

* Even supernatural and spiritual perceptions.

2 See above, p. 96. — 3 *Ascent,* bk. II, c. 12-13.

4 The signs *(Ascent, ibid.)* that allow the abandonment of meditation correspond to those of initial infused contemplation as explained in the *Night* (1, 9) See below, p. 838. Some authors have doubted this relation, but their grounds appear insufficient. The active night of the soul remains conditioned by the passive night of the senses. St. John reproduces the truly mystical features of the latter in the *Ascent* (1. c.) in order to show when meditation may be left off. It may not, therefore, be considered as "active contemplation ". The latter, nevertheless is to be found in many passages of book π.

5 The word WAY here means the *entirety of means by which a soul is brought to perfection:* those who consider ascetism capable of leading thereto without the mystical gifts, distinguish the *ascetic way* from the *mystical way* which involves the graces termed mystical in addition to asceticism : those who deny this capability to asceticism admit therefore but a single way, ascetic and mystical (See above, p. 362). The word *way* is taken below in the meaning of *sta°e* on the road to perfection : this is the sense ot the expressions *purgative, illuminative* and *unitive ways.*

' This is the "centre of perspective in the saint's teaching" says Fr. Gabriel *{Art. cit.,* in *Vie Spirit.,* p. 225-243). It may be regarded as the fullest spiritual maturity of the soul.

mystical graces though inferior to those of the transforming union [1] and of *purgative way* to the state of those souls who are undergoing the night of the senses [2] and even more so those who have not yet come so far.

But, in addition to the degrees that register the *stages of* the way, there are others which correspond to the manner in which these mystical gifts are *shared*[3], for, on the one hand grace does not meet with the same resistance in every soul nor needs to carry out the same purifications[4,5] while on the other hand all are not called to an equal degree of union [6], so that the sternness and duration of the trials are exactly proportionate to the degree of union that God foresees and desires for each one[6]. This is even more noticeable as regards the other graces of preparation. From this fresh angle it would be possible to multiply the manners of sharing the mystical graces; we shall content ourselves with two: 1. *Gentle participation,* peacable and tranquil, though not very deep (often remaining unperceived'[7]; 2. *Violent participation* which bathes the soul in vivid light and intense feeling and occasionally reacts upon the body.

The importance given to the purification of the soul in the teaching of St. John of the Cross leads him to speak often of night or dark night. The usual meaning of this word is *purification,* either of the "senses" or of the mind[8,9] Other meanings, however, are included. Night is, first of all, [1] *privation* [9]: natural night takes away light from the eyes; the mystic night withdraws their natural objects from the "senses" and the "mind", and is meant for the soul's purification. The imagination is deprived of its images and the mind is reduced to pure and simple *faith.* From this viewpoint, the night is *dark.* Yet in another manner, it is *luminous,* for this purification disposes it for the reception of the divine light and since this is not to be perceived directly by inferior, even rational, faculties (sources of discursive activity) these faculties remain in "darkness" And yet again, God Himself remains so transcendent and incomprehensible even to the soul that enjoys the closest

1 "Way of those who advance" or "illuminative way" or "way of infused contemplation". *Dark Night,* i, c. 14; 11, c. 1.

2 *Dark Night,* I, st. I.

3 See Fr. Gabriel's art. (p. 243-254).

4 Mary alone never hindered the operation of the Holy Ghost *(Ascent,* m. I). But there have been other souls who hindered it hut very little during their lives. See Fr. Gabriel, *op. cit.,* p. 252 (on the Little Flower).

5 *Ascent,* Π, c. 4. — 6 *Dark Night,* 1, c. 14.

7 Carmelite theologians call this union the *nnio sobria.* Thom, de J., *Oral, div.,* iv, 5; Philip de la S. Tr., *Sum. th. myst.,* in, tr. 1, <1. I, a. 4.

8 See p. 827.

9 *Ascent,* 1, c. 3.

union, that this also may be termed a night[1]. But because of the great light that bathes the mind, it may also be likened to the dawn[2]. Thus the way that leads to union and union itself may be called both dark and luminous according to the viewpoint. Night becomes light yet remains gloomy. Strange language; yet, if we consider it from the author's standpoint there is no contradiction in the concepts.

B) Characteristic points of the doctrine.

The teaching of St. John of the Cross is meant for souls already steadfast in virtue who are advancing to perfection. Its chief originality lies in the purifications that precede the union and it is with these we shall deal especially. His views on the union itself, however, also deserve mention.

I. The purifications[3]. There are two kinds of purifications, those of the senses and those of the mind and both are active or passive accordingly as they are produced or undergone by man. The NIGHT OF THE SENSES[4], which is the first, begins by purifying the soul in its sensitive or lower part: it consists either in interior mortification *(active night}*[5] or in certain supernatural trials meant to wean the soul from sensible affections and consolations *(passive night}***. THE Night of the Mind is that which purifies the rational and spiritual part of the soul: *actively*[7] it consists in a certain simplified practice of the theological virtues and especially of faith, a practice that closely depends on the passive night of the senses; *passively*[8] it may be called in general all the purifying trials of advanced contemplatives; in the *stricter meaning* however, as taken by St. John of the Cross, it consists in that especially exquisite spiritual trial that forms the threshhold of the transforming union (which he regards as the true unitive way).

[1] The journeying of the soul towards the divine union deserves to be called Night for *three reasons:* I. because of the renunciations imposed from the outset; 2. because of the means, i. e., faith; 3. because of the last end, God, the Incomprehensible Being. *Ascent,* 1., c. 2.

[3] To the above three reasons correspond three nights or rather three parts of the same night: twilight (night of the senses), midnight (simple faith), dawn (union). *Ibid.*

[3] *Ascent oj Mount Carmel* and *Dark Night.*

[4] *Ascent,* bk. I, c. 1-12. — [5] *Ibid.,* ch. 13.

[6] *Dark Night,* bk. I, c. 8-14. Ch. 1-7 enumerates the imperfections to be uprooted.

[1] *Ascent,* bk. II-III. — [8] *Dark Night,* bk. II.

The passive night of the senses marks the beginning of the mystical ways : it is termed *arid quietude* and corresponds[1]* to the blissful quietude of St. Ierosa. It should therefore be placed, despite St.John's appellation of *purgative i.uay*\ between the "unitive way" (usual term) and the "simple unitive way" *{illuminative way,* for St. John). The jassive night of the mind (in its strict meaning) should on the contrary ie put at the end of the latter, at the beginning of the transforming union.

a. The purification of the senses is the first, to be accomplished, not only by means of mystical graces, but first by asceticism—active night of the senses—which is truly characteristic of the method of St. John of the Cross.

I. Ihe ample explanation of the reasons for this asceticism termed Active Night of the Senses is extremely eloquent, but its practice, reduced by St. John to two basic recommendations is still more clear-cut : i. *Imitation of Jesus Christ in all things :* "Before all. have a constant wish to imitate Christ in all things : shape your life to His and meditate upon it, so that you may know how to act like Him in every circumstance". 2. Mortification of natural inclinations and their repression : "However the senses may incline, should they not tend purely to the glory and honour of God, renounce such leanings and mortify them for the love of Jesus Christ". He adds: "This method achieves rapid progress '. The better to facilitate this practice he points out four *fassions* needing special attention ; joy, hope, fear, and sorrow. As rules he gives these austere counsels[3][4]: "Seek not that which is easiest but what is most difficult;—Not the most delicious but the most tasteless;—Not what pleases, but what holds no attraction ; etc. '. He advises strife against the three concupiscences* (z *Ep. Joan.*. il, 16), and ends by compressing all his ascetic teaching on the means of attaining the summit of Mount Carmel[5], or the transforming union, into a dozen particularly famous lyrical phrases in which the *All* and the *Nothing* frequently provide a striking contrast[6]. *All,* that is God perfectly possessed in the perfect union ; and Christ also, W ho reveals Himself therein. *Nothing,* that is all that is not God and which must

1 Probably occurring earlier in many, if not all souls. '

• The insistence of the St. John of Cross on spiritual purifications well explains the expression *purgative way,* which thus includes all the earlier discipline of the soul, a discipline which, since he is interested only in the mystical aspect—he considers to be merely a preparation. Similarly his stressing of faith and contemplation in the next stage justifies the name of *illuminative way* which he gives it (see p. 833, n. 1) instead of the expression *unitive way* (inceptive) usually found in the explanations of other spiritual teachers. See the schema, p. 840.

3 *Aseent,* bk. I, c. 4-12.

4 *Ibid.,* c. 13.

5 A graphical diagram, drawn by John himself and reproduced at the beginning of the work, shews that the only direct route for reaching the summit of perfection is that of abnegation in all its phases, symbolised by the *Nothing* repeated 5 limes.

6 In order to love all, seek satisfaction in nothing;
In order to know all, seek knowledge in nothing;
In order to possess all, seek to possess nothing, etc.

be esteemed as nothing by the soul which desires perfect union with God. " In this nakednesss the spirit finds its quiet and its rest " *.

2. Even partial quietude may only be obtained, in an arid but extremely efficacious form, by *the passive night of the senses.* Its purpose is to strip devout souls of the unconscious and subtle remains of the capital vices which taint even their most saintly works and which are analysed pitilessly by the author'. It mainly consists in *spiritual aridities,* which not only deprive the sensitive faculties of consolations but also prevent the mind from meditating and reasoning. This "night possesses *three essential qualities* i. persistent spiritual insensibility, without apparent natural cause; 2. an habitual thought of God, mingled with some anxiety ; 3. impossibility of thought during prayer 1 2 In this state, therefore, the soul seems to be divided. On the one hand it feels an ardent love of God, which is almost always present and turns all its aspirations towards Him ; yet, on the other hand this love is filled with anxiety since it feels deprived of God and desires to experience once again a presence it once knew4. This constant need of union with God 5 clearly distinguishes the trial in question from any insensibility resulting from a naturally unhealthy disposition, or from sin 6.

During this stale, the soul must not only practise patience but yield itself trustfully to *God's action,* and give up reasoning during meditation, at least for a time, the better to receive the deep love that is poured into it by grace in a secret *contemplation,* which, though still imperfect, is none the less real7. Such is St. John's explanation *of* this supernatural trial whose advantages, also, he sets out.

'Die fruits of this arid quietude are indeed admirable8. In addition to the knowledge of God it brings with it, and the love of God it kindles9, it provides the soul with greater self-knowledge, greater reserve and reticence in the presence of God, more disinterestedness, humility and obedience10; it heals the soul of spiritual avarice or other vestiges of vice and fosters the flowering of the moral virtues11; in brief it gives peace to the soul at this inception of purification12, for, as yet, there is but a beginning : peace will not be integral until the whole sensitive soul obeys the mind and this latter will not truly dominate the former until it has itself been purified 13.

1 *Ascent,* i, c. 13.

2 *Dark Night,* I, c. I-7. See above, analysis of the work.

3 *Ibid.,* I, c. 9. Cf. *ibid.,* c. 8-11.

4 Whether sensible consolations that have disappeared or mystical graces of blissful quiet. In the latter case the trial is greater.

5 *Jbid.,* c. it.

6 The trial of aridity may be accompanied by violent temptations which make it harder to endure *{ibid.,* c. 14). but since temptation is not sin, they in no way diminish the supernatural quality of this state.

7 This contemplation lays hold directly of the will alone, as in the quietude described by St. Teresa; it is nevertheless a knowledge, general and confused, yet alive and loving. *Ibid.,* c. 8 sq. See above, p. 829. As knowledge it is in the mind, but is not a result of its discursive activity.

8 *Ibid.,* c. 11-14. —9 *Ibid.,* c. 11. — 10 *Ibid., c.* 12.

11 *Ibid.,* c. 13.

13 *Ibid.,* c. 14.

Dark Night, I c. I, 3.

b. The purification of the mind, therefore, must follow that of the senses and is likewise both *active* and *passive.* The passive purification, however, at least in its acute form, does not usually take place until a long period, stretching into years, has passed by r. Having overcome the first trial, the soul advances on the road to perfection with a swelling and joyful heart : it takes frequent repose in sweet and loving contemplation which is reflected (at least in part in the now purified senses2. It also undergoes *interior trials* (darkness, aridity, anguish)3, marking the beginning of the passive purification of the mind and remotely foreshadowing a more perfect union. The latter is directly heralded by a more acute crisis which is pre-eminently the *passive night op the mind,* marking the end of the " way of progress" 4. This way of progress is, in reality, the first stage of the state of perfection, and is accompanied by mystical favours even in a very high and sometimes extraordinary degrees. The blessed Doctor, speaking, in the *Ascent of Mount Carmel,* of the *activity* the soul must now develop, advises it to renounce even these <jreat favours.

i. The activity proper to this state is reduced by Si. John to the *practice op the three theological virtues,* faith, hope and charity. Thinking only of leading his disciple to the highest peaks, he envisages this practice, mainly in its purifying aspect, inasmuch as it weans the soul from all that is not God and renders it more fitted to receive the transforming union which implies a perfect moral assimilation of the mind to God. This special purpose explains why St. John does not stress, as did St. Teresa, the part played by the human nature of Christ even in the prayer of contemplatives. He goes so far as to consider as possible obstacles to the transforming union those spiritual favours which St. Teresa describes as precious qualities of a very close union. Yet here is no contradiction, but merely a difference of purpose and viewpoint. St. John's method is explained by his predominant and even exclusive interest in the end to be attained6. The theological virtues become for him not only means of union but also means of *active purification*7.

This purifying function is8 ascribed mainly to faith, particularly in the course of prayer9. In enlightened souls it more than takes the place of imaginative representations, which, though useful in their proper place in *meditation,* now are but a hindrance10. The presence of the superior graces that take the place of reasoning is recognisable by three signs: i. impossibility of discursive prayer; 2. no desire to use the

1 */bid.,* c. I. — * *Ibid.* 3 *Ibid.* * *Ibid.*
5 *Ibid.,* Cf. *Ascent,* II, c. 14-30; nq c. 29-44.
6 Sec e. g., *Ascent,* 11, c. 4. — 7 c $
8 *Ibid.,* c. 2-3. 6-8. — 9 *tbid..* c. 11-13. — w *Jbia., c.* n.

imagination which remains fairly untroubled; 3. loving concentration on God, in peace, quiet and repose'. These qualities correspond to those of contemplation in arid quietude[1], save that aridity itself is not mentioned, for once this trial has been suffered, there is no need to return to meditation if the other conditions are fulfilled, at least when the soul is strengthened and has "acquired the habit of contemplation in an almost perfect way"[3]. Thus, simple faith usually suffices to kindle love in prayer when the soul is supernatmaily enlightened. In relation to God, this faith purifies the understanding, which has then no further need of recourse to numerous and clumsy intermediaries. In fact, the soul should avoid individual supernatural images and perceptions[4][5]

This active purification of the mind is consummated in perfect hope which causes to be despised all individual objects, inferior to God, that are contained in the memory, just as perfect charity turns aside the will from all the individual goods that might seduce it and prevent it from falling in entirely with the will of God[6]. The active practice of the theological virtues for the purpose of purifying the mind thus consists, for St. John of the Cross, in an effort to dispel all objects inferior to God[6]. And this activity is limited only by its end; i. e., the submission of the simplified soul to the higher operation of the Holy Ghost, since a relatively perfect contemplation lies at the centre of all this activity.

2. This active purification of the mind, even when accompanied by the ordinary passive purifications already mentioned is not ordinarily enough to wean the soul wholly from its own interests in order to make it perfectly fitting for the closest union. Before it is transformed by the jrace of union, the soul must undergo a particularly exquisite trial, cnown pre-eminently as the passive night of the mind, which St. John of the Cross[7], like St. Teresa[8], describes at length. The soul must detach itself from certain habitual imperfections (torpidity, wandering, confidences) or actual weaknesses (exaggerated clinging to spiritual gifts)[9] and become completely spiritualised in all its operations[10]. The purifying agent of the mind is again *infused contemplation,* more penetrating than during the first night. It opens the mind to all kinds of imperfections hitherto unperceived, and contrasts it to the overwhelming grandeur of God"[11]. The will, also, is often deprived of spiritual delights",

[1] *Ibid.,* c. 11-12.

[2] See above, p. 836. The parallelism of the two texts appears indisputable to us, though it is not admitted by some authors. The variations in the two texts and the order of the signs are to be explained by the different character and purpose of the two works. Aridity, especially, is not a constant sign of contemplation. The three signs under one form or another must be present at one and the same time.

[3] *Ascent,* II, c. 13.

[4] *Ibid.,* c. 14-30. See the analysis above.

[5] See above, analysis of bk. ill of the *Ascent.*

[6] In these principles maybe found the essentials of a true active contemplation, depending, however, on infused contemplation.

[7] *Dark Night,* bk. II (entire).

[8] *Int. Cast.,* vith M., c. I, II. See above, p. 821.

[9] *Dark Night,* II, c. 2. — [10] *Ibid.,* c. 3.

[11] *Dark Night,* n. c. 5-6. — " *Ibid.,* c. 7.

and the faculties in general, inoperative in prayer, suffer from their idleness, but they thus become spiritualised and learn to co-operate in the divine operation *. This purification resembles that which is undergone by wood in the fire, before it is totally consumed 2. The night of the mind is a veritable *purgatory* that consumes the soul in the fire of love3. Whilst God is communicating His wisdom with supernatural touches, the anguish of love wounds both the understanding and the will4. Yet despite its anxiety and the invading darkness5, the faithful soul retains a deep peacefulness and a constancy that is the more stable because it has become more spiritual6. All these interior trials7, or rather contemplation, which is their source, form the " secret ladder"8 by which the soul climbs out of itself in order to live wholly in God, in the transforming union.

2. The transforming union. The encl of the *Ascent of Mount Carmel* that was to have dealt with this subject is no longer extant. We are able, nevertheless, to learn in some measure St. John's ideas from what he says of this state at the beginning of book II9, and especially his description of the effects of the passive night of the mind lo. With marked insistence, he speaks of a *spiritualisation* of all the soul's activity : the faculties and operations, he says, become more divine than human11; the faculties acquire a marvellous aptitude for understanding, without any effort, all that is proposed to them 12; The will, burning with love, becomes wholly divine and merges with the will of God J3. The *three theological virtues* come to perfection and become the only ornament of the soul pleasing to God and the only force that unite Him to the whole man M. When love has attained to the last of the nine degrees obtainable in this world it is extremely ardent and pure, and very near to beatific love (loth degree) χ5.

It is very remarkable that these traits are to be found in almost the same form in the descriptions of the *Living Flame* and the *Canticle 16.* In these, the transforming union represents " the perfect maturity of grace, charity, the virtues

---

* */bid.,* c. 8. The supernatural light which the understanding is unable to perceive directly, nevertheless illuminâtes it when it has to judge of the truth or falsity of something, and is manifest in its effects. *Ibid.*

8 */bid.,* c. io. — 3 */bid., c.* 12. — 4 */bid., c. 13.* — 5 *Jbid.,* c. 16.

6 */bid.,* c. 9, 13, 24. — 7 See their description in the work itself.

8 */bid.,* c. 17-18. — ' *Ascent,* ii, c. 4.

" *Dark Night,* π, c. 3, 9, 11, 13» and */assim.*

» *Ibid.,* c. 3. — " */bid.,* c. 8. — 13 */bid.,* c. 13.

'4 */bid.,* c. 21. — *5 */bid.,* c. 19-20.

,ss See *art. cit.,* on the *Union transformante* by I. R. Gabriel *{Vie spirit.,* J927).

and the gifts " τ. The assimilation to God, the " divinisation " it produces "overflows from the essence of the soul and the faculties : the soul may be said to be divinised even in its operations " 2. Then indeed " the soul is moved in all things by the Holy Ghost " 3. God becomes the prime mover of the understanding, the memory, and the will; the joy of the soul is the veiy joy of God 4. Now there is more than a full agreement of the two wills: conformity is a *deliberate* donation; transforming union is an *effective* donation 5 accomplished by the real and total 6 submission of the soul to the Holy Ghost Whose seven gifts finally come to full fruition without hindrance? in a lasting peace8. The basis of this real donation is a communication of the very *wisdom* of God 9 to the soul, which receives it in a loving embrace10. This eminently theological and practical conception of the transforming union is that which best represents the work of the great Carmelite Doctor in general, and one in which he is on common ground with St. Teresa.

9

COMPARATIVE SCHEMA OF THE WAYS.

Usual division	St. Teresa f *Castle) ll*	St. John of the Cross
Purgative way *(Incipientes)*	1st and 2nd Mansions (Active prayer)	
Illuminative way *(Progredientes)*	.7. Hird. Mans. : Active prayer	
	B. ivth. Mans. : Quietude,	Night of the senses (purg. way)
Unitive way *(Perfecti)*	*.1.* vth Mans. : Simple union (vith. Mans.)	Night of the mind (ilium, way)
	/>'. vuth Mans. : Transforming union	Transforming union (unitive wav).

• *Ibid.,* p. 228.
• *Ibid.,* p. 230. Cf. *Living FL,* st. 2
s *Cant.,* st. 12.
4 *Living FL,* st. 2.
s The first corresponds to spiritual betrothal, the second to spiritual marriage.
6 Expression to be taken in a large sense, as meaning an ordinary movement. There may be exceptions; *ibid.,* 21.
' *Living FL,* st. 3; *Cant.,* st. 26, 27, 28.
8 *Cant.* 24.
9 *Cant.,* st. 22.
10 *Cant.,* st. 26-28. Cf. Fr. Gabriel, *op. cit.,* p. 238-243.
" Only the most characteristic prayer of each mansion is shewn here; See schema, p. 816.

CHAPTER X.

Saint Francis of Sales.

Special Bibliography :

Editions : New complete edition by the nuns of the Visitation at Annecy, begun in 1892, *Œuvres.* 22 volumes published : vol. 1-11. controversy ; vols III-VI, spirituality ; vols Vli-x, sermons ; vols xi-xxi' letters (2100); vol. xxii (1925), *opuscula* (1st volume only).

Studies: Dom B. Mackey, (all in French), *Introduction générale* in *Œuvres* (vol. 1) and various special *Introductions,* especially for the *Controverses* (vol. 1), *La vie dévote* (v. 3), the *Amour de Dieu* (v. iv-v), the *Entretiens* (v. vi), the *Sermons* (v. vu), the *Lettres* (vol. Xi). At the end of the *Lettres* (v. XXl), a general study of the saint "according to his letters" by the Editors. M. Hamon, *Vic de S. François de S'.,* 2 vols, Paris, 7th ed., (completed by M. Gonthier and Letourneau), 1909. A. de Margerie, S. François de S., (coll. *Les Saints'),* Paris 1902. P. Strowski, *Introduction à Γhistoire du sentiment religieux en France* (thesis) Paris, 1898; 5. *François de S.,* (Coll. *La Pensée chrété),* Paris, 1908. H. Bremond, *Hist. lift, du sentiment religieux,* vol. 1, (p. 68-128), vol. n (p. 537-584); vol. vu (p. 5-162). F. Vincent, 5 *Fr. de S. directeur d âmes. Eéducation de la volonté,* Paris, 1922. A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu,* p. 324-329; Ó'. *Fr. de Sales, contemplatif dès sa jeunesse,* in *Vie Spirit.,* 1927 (vol. 16) p. 38-51. P. PoURRAT, *La spirit, chrit,,* vol. m, p. 406-481. R. PerniN, *Fr. de Sales (saint),* in *Diet, théol.,* col. 736-762 (in 1913), also in Catholic Encyc., vol. vi, p. 220-221. See also Mgr Lavallée, *Le réalisme de S. Fr. de S.,* in *Documentation cath.,* 1923, March loth, p. 579-592.

I. — LIFE AND WORKS OF THE SAINT (1567-1622).

Saint Francis of Sales is, among the moderns, together with St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, the great doctor of the spiritual life. He has set out a teaching similar to theirs, but adopted a special point of view which brings him nearer to us and is therefore, in a sense, more human ; hence the exceptional usefulness of his work. This quality of his teaching is due partly to his own character and partly to the influence of his early training.

He was a humanist in all the meaning of the word. Born of a noble family of Savoy he was sent to *Paris* at the age of fourteen (1581) where for seven years (1581-1588) he studied under the Jesuits who in the XVIth century gave

such an impetus to the Christian revival of humanism. At this period he studied, in addition to literature and philosophy, Hebrew and Greek, Holy Writ and theology. Soon he was to study law at "*Padua,* fine flower of Italian civilisation, amalgam of Venice and Florence, instinct with the memory of Petrarch" x. He was not merely a Doctor of Laws when he returned after 4 years (1588-1592): "With the robust French *limpidity* he combined henceforth the somewhat affected and fine Italian *charm*" 2. The influence of his masters imbued him with a frank *optimism,* fully confident in the powers of human natures. Like the Jesuits he preferred to regard the mysterious agreement of predestination and freewill from the human angle, especially after the temptation to dispair that he underwent about 1586 when he was obsessed with the idea that he was destined to become an eternal example of the divine justice 4. His passion for learning in no way hindered his advance in *virtue* and in 1593, he turned his back on a brilliant career in order to enter the ranks of the clergy.

He soon passed through the lower degrees of the hierarchy and reached the episcopate. The first years of his priesthood (1593-1599) were notable, (from 1594 to 1598) for his *conversion* of the whole of the reformed district of *Le Chablais* in 1597 and 1598. There remain as a witness of his apostolate his *Controversies* with the Calvinists 5 consisting of the *tracts* he composed in order to refute the Protestant errors and prove Catholic truths. These were loose leaflets distributed to the people or placed on the walls in the market places or streets (hence their name of *placards').* During this mission he also began his "*Defense of the Standard of the Cross*" 6 written to refute a Calvinist pamphlet. This was not published until 1600 when he was no longer a missionary. In 1599 he became *coadjutor* to the Bishop of Geneva (Annecy). Clement VIII, who saw him in Rome at this time, spoke admiringly of his theological learning. While stayng in Paris for religious business in 1602 he made the acquaintance of eminent churchmen. At the end of that year he became *bishop of* the diocese and was for twenty years a true pastor, combining with his proverbial

1 F. Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 4. — 3 *Ibid.,* p. 4-5. — 3 p. 25.97.

<()n this temptation see II Bremond, *op. cit.,* 1, p. 86-02. ' F. Vincent, *op-* "<·* p. 37 sq.

5 *Works,* vol. I. — 6 *Ibid.,* vol. II

mildness a great charity for the poor and a firm government of his flock.

The forms of pastoral activity he most preferred seem to have been preaching and spiritual direction. He excelled in the latter. *The ministry of the word* engrossed him : he preached not only at Annecy but also outside his diocese, especially at Paris where not a day passed without a sermon, during the two long visits he made there in 1602 and 1609. He explains his method in his "*Letter on Preaching*" addressed to the Archbishop of Bourges x. The Bull making him a Doctor calls him " the Master and Restorer of Sacred Eloquence What remains of his sermons 1 affords but a feeble conception of the effect of his preaching, which though it dragged a little, was sparkling with conviction and filled with supernatural sweetness. The best part of his time, however, was given to *spiritual direction* both in and out of the confessional. After he was raised to the episcopate, finding the conversion of the Protestants to be less urgent, he gave himself wholly to the training of souls in the Christian life : " Above all, and in every circumstance, he stands out as a guide of conscience and a master of the spiritual life "3. The greater part of his *Letters* (more than 2000 arc extant) consists of spiritual guidance for all occasions, in the course of which the saint " deals with every subject with equal care, and every soul with deep respect ". He taught souls above all "to listen readily to the master within, the only real director "4. His correspondence with St. Jeanne de Chantal is particularly valuable.

His spiritual advice was usually meant for *layfolk,* and it was for them5 that he wrote his "Introduction to the Devout Life"6, the first edition of which dates from 1609. The *devotion* to which he calls his *Philothea* is ardent and strong enough to make the soul "strive carefully, often and promptly ". In order to acquire this love the soul must be purified by the practices of the *purgative way,* treated in the 1st Part. Progress in devotion is ensured by the exercises of the *illuminative way,* treated in the four following books. The IInd Part deals with : *a) meditation,* which, according to the Salesian method, involves 1. preparation (presence of God, invocation, proposition of the

1 *Letter 2/9* (vol. Nil).

2 *ibid.,* vol. VII-X (vols, vu-vin, autograph sermons; ix-x sermons written down by listeners, especially at the Visitation). Cf. PsRNIN, 0/. *cit.,* col. 748-750. — 3 F. Vincent, *op.at.,* p. 7. — 4 R. Pernin, *op. at.,* col. 751.

5 The work was first made up by a series of letters of spiritual direction to Mme de Channoisy. — *Œuvres,* vol. in.

mystery); 2. considerations; 3. alléchons and resolutions; 4. spiritual bouquet; ¿5) spiritual *exercises*·, r) the *Sacraments.* The Hird Part gives advice on the *practice of* the most necessary *virtues;* the ivth provides weapons against temptation and the VJth counsels retreats and the renewal *of* good resolutions. The' work had an enormous yogue and created within the Church a current of devotion which has never, perhaps, been surpassed. Religious, no less than the laity, benefited by it. Its influence is still vigorous. The lines of age that some profess to find on the forehead of " Philothca ", do but throw into greater relief the wisdom of his counsels.

It would indeed have been astonishing had a guide such as St. Francis of Sales neglected mysticism r. His initiation in this *learning* probably dates frohi the first years of his episcopate, notably the visit to Paris (1602) which brought him into contact with so. many devout persons (Madame Acarie, Bertille...). Yet his practical introduction to this infused theology would appear to have taken place much earlier. The *Treatise on the Love of God,* published in 1616, though begun in 1607, is a masterpiece which implies in its author, not only learning, but also the experience and maturity that come with time alone. And indeed, none was more fitted for the reception of the divine impression than this fundamentally righteous soul, so used to the struggle against self (the *Spiritual Combat* was his vade-mecum) this calm and peaceful, affectionate and courageous soul, this man of such charming and simple nature2. In such a soul charity found fertile soil and the Holy Ghost held sway. In consequence the saint possessed, even in his first letters, a *method* which is radically the same as that of the last letters he wrote, despite all the progress that is discernible in the latter. The works of St. Teresa, which he read later in 1605, possibly contained much he had not suspected. Nevertheless, he in no wise, altered the essentials of his *method,* even in his direction of the *ardent* Baroness de Chantal whom grace was then *forcefully* urging towards perfection and whom the Carmelites of Dijon, in his opinion, were inviting to a *hasty simplification.* No lack of psycho-

1 See Dom Mackey's Introduction to the *Treatise on the Love of God,* vol. I\", p. XXIX sq. Cf. H. Bremond, *op. cit.,* 11, p. 537 sq.

· The following, according to his *Letters,* is " his true and complete description : strong and luminous intellect, acute judgment, simplicity of heart combined with practical common-sense, broadmindedness, frankness tempered by a smiling benevojencç.... inexhaustible tenderness ifi his friendships, .justifiable -pride in» his name and race, unlimited love of Çod and of souls,, all animated and, sanctified by a superabundance of grace ; in, it word, a rare and splendid inpdel of humanity and holiness ". The Editors ofithç- *CEuVres,* vol. XXI, .p; rx:xxix.

logical understanding 1 but well advised prudence led him to restrain her and keep her in the " lower valleys " and on the "broad highway"2. He thus aided her to mount by easy stages, and condescended to be her companion in conquering the spiritual peaks that he himself had already reached 3. His unerring guidance is a proof that he had already done so, almost perhaps without realising it, so little did he care for self examination 4. He continued his direction for the sake of the nuns of the Visitation whom he had shepherded around St. Jeanne de Chantal at Annecy (1610) and the most precious fruit of their collaboration is undoubtedly thè great mystical work, which more than any other of his writings, earned him the reputation and title of Doctor of the Church.

The Treatise on the Love of God. is unrivalled in its originality and profundity35 The *doctrinal explanation* lacks nothing: its twelve books comprise a *theoretical* part, a kind of speculative introduction (bk. i-iv) and a *practical* part dealing with the perfect love that results from *prayer* (bk. v-vn, the real core of the work), and then perfect love as seen in its *fruits* (bk. VIII-IX) and its *qualities* (bk. X-Xl); The xnth book forms a kind of practical appendix. In the course *of* the treatise thè author rises to the highest peaks of contemplation. He has his own way of looking at the mystical graces, a way that is not that of St. Teresa and which should be carefully noted. The great Carmelite was fundamentally a *mystic* and invariably stresses the infused gifts: These actual manifestations of God's presence in souls, so well calculated to kindle love, were paramount for her, so that even when speaking of asceticism, the practice *of* virtue, the fulfilment of humble duties, her advice was instinct with the spirit of mysticism. St. Francis of Sales, on the contrary, was primarily a *moralist* even when treating of mysticism6. He certainly studied, as did St. Teresa, the highest states of the interior life, but once he had assimilated her teaching, he transposed it in some sort to his own viewpoint, and adapted it to his own practical ends7 i. e., on the one hand he desired to explain

1 He himself admitted to a real gift in this respect. *Lett.* 277 (March 1605), vol. XIII, p. 18 (to Mme Brulart).

2 *Lett.* 339 (April Í906). He considered it an exaggeration to abandon meditation of Our Lord's human nature. St. Teresa still counsels this exercise t‹› contemplatives who are near to the transforming union. See above, p. 812, 821.

3 So naturally and simply did he lend himself to this task that the extent of his humility is scarce discernible.

‹ Cf. *Lett.* 174 (Jan. 1603); vol. XII, p. 167 sq.

5 See below,, doctrinal explanation.

e To our mind, moralism and mysticism do not exclude each other (See above, p. 861 and vol. I, p. 30).

7 St. John of the Cross made a similar adaptation when in order to foster the active purification of the mind, he considered as (possible) hindrances to union, the very graces of prayer which St. Teresa taught to be excellent means. The only difference lies in the point of view adopted.

to the nuns of the Visitation the very heart of even the most sublime mystical graces, so as not to wither up their desires for union with God, yet also with the purpose of restraining any imprudent seeking after extraordinary ways to holiness; on the other hand he wanted to shew them how to correspond effectively to the gifts of God, how to order their lives and with what interior acts they could best co operate with the supernatural activity of the Holy Ghost. The very scheme of the work, witnesses to this predominately moral interest'. In the second part the mystical doctrine of St. Teresa is linked up with a noble ascetic teaching that gives it a background and a support[1] Such an adaptation in so delicate a matter could hardly have been made by St. Francis had he not tried it in practice. We may wonder if he could even have conceived the general idea had he not had personal experience. He came to share the latter with the fervent group he assembled at Annecy together with St. Chantal. All were eventually destined to become members of the "true school of love"[3] [4]

The Convent of the Visitation founded at Annecy in 1610 was thus responsible in a great measure for the writing of the *Treatise on the Love of God.* This foundation was the Saint's dearest undertaking and his chief interest until his death. He gave to the new Order, in addition to the Rule of St. Augustine, *Constitutions* " of admirable wisdom, prudence and gentleness ", a *Customary* and a spiritual *Directory* or practical method of performing all one's actions under the eyes of Our Lord and according to His example^ To these writings, which may be compared to the *Spiritual Opuscula* [5], must be added the *Spiritual Conferences*^, a collection of familiar conversations with the nuns, who collected them. " This is a fairly complete treatise on religious observances and virtues; it may be called the treatise of the love of God as it is exemplified in the humble religious life of a sister of the Visitation. It is filled with deep thoughts on the highest perfection, written in a simple, lovable and altogether fatherly style"[6]. These familiar

1 See especially analysis of the second part, p. S56 sq.

3 The moralism of St. Francis *oí* Sales has been thrown into strong relief in recent years by Fr. Vincent *(op. cit.,* p. 99-148), who also calls it "moral asceticism" and contrasts it with the "asceticism of religion" or mysticism. At the oppositie extreme, H. Bremond *(op. cit.,* vol. vìi, p. 26-47) rightly insists on St. Francis' mysticism and shows him to be a qualified interpreter of " Theocentricism " and an adversary of anti-mystical "asceticism". The position we have adopted takes into account the best arguments put forward by both authors.

3 *Love of God,* bk. XII (c. 13).

4 Cf. R. Pernin, *op. cit.,* col 752-753.

5 *Ibid.,* 753-754· In the great edition of the *Œuvtes,* the *Opuscula* are divided into several series, vol. xxn sq.

6 *Œuvres,* vol. VI. Cf. R. Pernin, *op. cit.,* col. 746-748. — 7 *Ibid.,* 747.

talks which are, despite their defects [1], one of the best sources of Salesian spirituality were not published until after the Saint's death which took place at Lyons on December 22nd 1622. He was canonised in 1665 and declared a Doctor of the Church by Pius IX in 1887.

II. SPIRITUAL DOCTRINE.

Saint Francis of Sales is indisputably the greatest Teacher of spirituality in *modern* times. No one has surpassed nor, in all probability, rivalled him. His *influence* has been not only practical, but has also been felt in the doctrinal domain in the fullest sense of the term. Among those who continued the work of the Fathers whose works we have studied in these volumes, he is one of the most outstanding; his name comes last but far from least at the close of this glorious register.

He himself had a great esteem for the Fathers and frequently quoted them; his writings are strewn with Patristic texts [2]. He turned for preference "to Saint Augustine, the Father of theology, St. Gregory the Great, St. Chrysostom, the prince of Christian eloquence; the energetic language of St. Jerome delighted him no less than the sweet words of St. Bernard; and as regards controversy, we must add St. Cyprian, Tertullian and Vincent of Lerins" [3]. Moreover, even in his method he is closer to the Fathers than to the Scholastics. He inclines to give an affective tone even to his dogmatic, and especially his moral speculation. "He urges lhe soul not to be content, in its relations with God, merely with the simplest Christian life; he preaches *devoutness,* an ever growing perfection of the *love of God*" [4].

Devoutness and the love of God are the two great stages of perfection; in the first it is sown, in the second reaped. He set out this teaching with graceful charm and his honeyed and flowery style has sometime caused the very precise *principles* that underlie it to be neglected. We shall outline these in the first place before speaking of *Salesian devotion and ascesis* and of *the love of God and mysticism according to St. Francis.*

A). Theoretical foundations of Salesian spirituality.

Saint Francis of Sales brought together the theoretical principles of his spiritual teaching in the first books of his

[1] Due to the manner in which they were collected, and their posthumous publication. — [2] Dom Mackey, *Gen. Introd.,* vol. I, p. LXI sq.
[3] *Ibid.* — [4] R. Pernin, *op. cit.,* col. 755.

Treatise on the Love of God which deal with spirituality in general The first four books and some chapters of the others could no doubthave been omitted to suit the inclinations of those souls who seek divine love in its practice alone; but they will nevertheless find them of real service if they read them devoutly. Moreover there are many perhaps who would be disappointed not to find here all that truly pertains to a treatise on heavenly love". We should certainly have been sorry not to find a magnificent ascetic and mystical edifice laid by the author himself on foundations both of a natural or philosophical, and supernatural or theological nature.

As a psychologist rather than a metaphysician St. Francis of Sales seeks within the human soul the natural seat of divine love. This is the subject of book I. With his well known fertility *of* fancy and his great perspicuity he speaks successively according to a skilfully arranged plan of : i. the *importance* of love : though the will governs all the faculties of the soul, love governs the will ' ; 2. the *nature of* love : love implies some proportion between the will and good : hence arises a complacency which produces a movement (inclination) towards the good which is consummated in union : complacency is the essential element3; 3. the *effects of* love : the union produced by love is spiritual and the more love is freed of mere human affection the closer is the union3; 4. the *parts* of the soul: we can perceive in the soul various degrees of perfection according to the difference of the faculties or inclinations (senses, mind) and particularly notice the undoubted superiority of the spiritual faculty which by a simple glance of the understanding and an equally simple feeling of the will is led to acquiesce in the truth and will of God4; 5. *friendship;* this is a mutual love of benevolence, known to both friends and resulting in a perfect exchange of friendship ; better than simple friendship (without preference) is t le friendship of choice or dilection which may be either simple, excellent, or eminent, or lastly, incomparable; this latter is divine friendship or charity5; 6. lastly the relation of love to God : not only is there an admirable proportion between man and his Creator, but man has "a natural leaning to love God above all things", an imperfect inclination perhaps, but nevertheless of the greatest utility6.

In the three following books the holy doctor treats of the theology of divine love; the origin of love (bk. 11) its progress (bk. Hl), its loss (bk. IV). The *origin of* charity is explained by a series of acts that prepare it, first in God (universal Providence, decree of the Incarnation, the choice of Mary)7, and then in man8, by faith, hope, penance, and finally the loving gaze of Christ. This explanation ends with a glowing description of charity9. The following book shews that *progress* in love

' *Love of God,* bk. I. C. 1-5. — 3 /W., c66,;9.· ?? 3 C* IO'
* *Ibid.,* c. 'II-12. — 5 *Ibid.,* C. 13-14· — ' C' ζ5 }, -, r
7 *Love of God.* bk. II, c. 1-7. — 8 *Ibid.,* c. 8-21. — *Ibid.,* c. 22.

is possible and even easy, and though it remains relative in this life' it will come to perfection in heaven, a perfection that varies for each soul[2]3 Book IV sets out how love may also be lost by man's own fault l. It is our purpose to deal mainly with St. Francis' ideas on grace and predestination 45

Grace must intervene to produce and increase true love. The Saint's magnificent optimism is here based, according to the constantly invoked teaching of St. Augustine, on an unbounded confidence in the plenitude of aids vouchsafed by God and the power of their operation, an operation that attains its effects by its own power and can only be forestalled by the fault of man 5. Yet grace, though powerful, is also "gracious" and lacks all violence : "When our will accedes to the divine attraction and consents to the divine movement, it consents no less freely than it resists, when it so chooses, though *consenting* to grace depends *much more on grace* than on the will, while resistance to grace depends on the will alone " 6.* Same teaching with regard to sin : though man alone is responsible for resistance to grace 7} he should not think that lie alone effectively consents to it8. In eloquent passages the Saint says to those who take pride unto themselves : " Had grace not forestalled and filled thy heart with its *operation,* never would it have had the power nor the *will* to co-operate at all .. Is it not the madness of impiety to think that thou hast given holy, *efficacious* and living activity to the divine activity, simply because thou hast not turned it away from thee by thy resistance? " 9

Yet in explaining the mystery of predestination he prefers to look at it from the *human standpoint.* Though he makes no use of the expression *post preevisa merita,* he approves of it in his letter to Lessius (August 26th, 1618) Io. The *Treatise of the Love of God* is much less explicit. Speaking of final perseverance he enumerates in descending and ascending order the series " of the effects of Providence touching our salvation" and concludes : " God no doubt has prepared heaven only for those l le has foreseen would be l lis

l *Ixrue oj God,* bk. Ill, c. 1-8.
3 *Jbid.,* c. 915.
3 *Love of God,* bk. IV, c. 5.
4 M. Vincent who insists so much on St. Francis' Molinisni, touches on little but the question of predestination; *op. cit.,* p. 34-55.
5 *Love of God.,* bk. II, c. io. — ⅈ *Jbid.,* c. 12.
7 *ibid.,* bk. IV, c. 5· — 8 *Ibid.,* c. 6. — 9 *Ibid.*
,o See *hitrod.* to vol. IV of the *Œuvres,* p. xu.

servants;... but it depends on us to be His servants"[1]. But he desires that we should evince no curiosity about the decrees of Providence[2], and thinks that we can "find no better reason for the will of God, than that *will itself*". In any case he considers it a vain controversy, probably one of those of which he says : " I naturally detest all contentions and quarrels among Catholics which can have no useful outcome "[3]. This feeling is consonant with his advice to Paul V during the *De Auxiliis* controversies. He recommended the ending of the discussions and the placing of a ban of silence in these matters[4]. In brief, St. Francis of Sales in the questions on grace made use of a prudent and judicious eclecticism based on lengthy research in the Fathers[5], and eminently suited to his practical purpose.

B) Salesian devotion and asceticism.

I. The Bishop of Geneva had a clear perception of the exceptional part played by *the love of God* in Christian life, not only at the end of the interior progress towards God, but during the whole of the journey, right from the starting place. There indeed, love is still very imperfect, but it is real : the human heart naturally tends to love God, he says[6]. But it is not natural but supernatural and Christian love that the saint would have us cultivate and tend, until we attain devotion. The latter consists " in a certain degree oí excellent charity; not only does it make us prompt, active and diligent in keeping God's commandments; but, in addition, it stirs us to carry out, promptly and lovingly, as many good works as we can, even should they not be commanded, but only counselled or inspired "[7]. The *Treatise ou the Love of God,* in order to perfect charity, endeavours to intensify and *purify* the interior acts by which it unites us to God. The *Introduction to the Devout Life* is concerned with stirring up the activity of divine love in all its forms, even in beginners : " Devotion adds nothing to the

1 *Love of God.,* bk. in, c. 5. — 3 *Ibid.,* bk. iv, c. 7.

3 Lett. 711 (1-5 Sept. 1611) vol. xv, 95. — 4 See above, p. 777.

5 He read " 1200 pages of a great volume " in order to write 14 lines (probably those of bk. m, c. 5, concerning predestination) Cf. vol. iv, p. x i.i *(Introd.).*

6 *Love of God.,* bk. I, c. 15.

7 *Dev. Lite,* i, c. I. Divine love is called *ferace,* inasmuch "as it is an ornament of the soul , *chat tty* " in so much as it gives us strength for doing good, *devotion,* when it makes us not "only do well" but also "operali carefully, frequently, and promptly ", *Ibid.*

fire of charity save the flame that makes charity prompt and diligent, not only in keeping the commandments of God, but also in practising the counsels and heaven-sent inspirations ” L

According to all the masters, the duty of beginners and those who are already progressing is to give to divine love this impulsion towards goodness and virtue. St. Francis, however, even more than other teachers, liked to consider love not only as an end in itself, but also as a *means of-progress*, the first of all and the best fitted to destroy vice and bring forth virtue in the human heart. He distinguished, moreover, pious practices from the piety which is their source, and by so doing he succeeded in bringing devotion to the mixed company of the laity'. And he was careful to make it more than a vague aspiration: but since for him it was before all a very real *aspiration* he adapted it to individual needs by means of practical exercises, and especially prayer, for he realised that different sorts and conditions *of* men should practise virtue in diverse ways.

2. The large place given in the *Introduction* to methodical prayer 3 should be noted. Though St. Ignatius' influence is apparent, St. Francis' own touch is no less marked. In the 1st book he invites Philothea to meditate and thus enter on to the *purgative* way where she is to be purified of mortal sin and the inclination to sin : ten meditations are held out as models, extending from the Creation to Heaven, thus helping her to adhere to the devout life “ by way of choice This preliminary introduction is continued in book II (c. 1-9) 4.

The general method, of a very marked affective nature, is much less severe than that of the *Exercises* 5. But it is no less exact. 1. The *preparation* comprises: rt) placing oneself in the presence of God; *bf* invocation ; *c)* choice of a subject. 2. The first part, which is intellectual, is devoted to various *considerations* on a subject either conjured up by the imagination, or logically and carefully analysed if a simple truth is in question ; but whatever the acts, they should tend to move the will. 3. The second part of the meditation is above all *affective* and is meant to unite the soul to God in a heart to heart talk that kindles love and leads to good resolutions. 4. All prayer should indeed lead to *action,* the normal outcome of love. The final resolutions

1 *Ibid.* (end). — 3 Cf. F. Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 191-205. — 3 *Ibid.,* p. 291-345.

4 Book 11 and the following books correspond to what is usually termed the illuminative way.

5 See above, p. 796. The Sulpician method would seem to lie between that of St. Ignatius and St. Francis of Sales. It was first elaborated by M. Olier (1608-1657) who was content to indicate the essential acts of a very affective nature. M. Tronson (1622-1700) completed his work in order to help beginners and forestall inactivity or quietism. Cf. A Tanquerey, *Précis de th. asc. et myst.,* p. 448 sq. P. POURRAT, *La spirit. chrét.,* iv, p. 378-379. The excellence of this method is everywhere admitted.

should therefore pave the way for this activity even in its slightest details. The meditation ends with a spiritual bouquet, a devout thought meant to nourish loving affections and give rise to ejaculatory prayer throughout the day. All the elements of this prayer are not equally necessary. The considerations are only for the purpose of stimulating the affections, so that if the affections are found to be fixed on God without effort "You must give rein to them" *. Yet the Saint would not have us neglect preparation constantly, though it may at times be advantageously omitted -.

St. Francis counsels various simplified forms of meditation for certain circumstances. " He goes so far as to say that for some people and in some cases the best method is to have no method at all, and it may.be observed that as he grew older he became more tolerant and understanding in this-matter "3.

He warns the nuns of the Visitation against too much clinging to mere method and useless complications4. He reduces all prayer to a consideration, of Our Lord, either by thinking of Him in one of His mysteries (Death, Life, Passion) and this is the first way;5 or by conversing with Him simply in meditation upon the Gospels and the mysteries of faith, without using the imagination ; this is the second way; "much nobler and better than the first"6.

While on this subject St. Francis mentions an even simpler prayer, called *a simple repose in God* or the simple presence of God : for : "there are souls who are unable to dwell upon or to occupy their minds with any mystery, since they are attracted by a very sweet simplicity that holds them in great tranquillity before God, so that they need only to consider that they are in His presence and that He is their entire good"7. This prayer consists in a very pure though somewhat secret activity of faith in the presence of God, hope in its highest degree, and above all, charity8. It is obviously of a very mystical nature and well calculated to subject the soul to the Holy Ghost9. St. Francis of Sales, though approving this manner of prayer, at least for advanced souls, would not have us " seek of ourselves other higher ways of prayer, unless God freely grants them " ,0.

3. The founder of the Visitation seems to have had no inkling of the contrast that is sometimes made in our day

' *Devout Life,* nnd 1'., c. 8. — 2 *Lett.* 581 (11 March 1610), vol. xiv, p. 266.
3 F. Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 299. —4 *Spirit. Conf,* win, p. 347-351.
s *Ibid.* — 6 *Ibid.* — *i Ibid.*
8 The *IInd Conference,* on confidence, treats at length of abandoning oneself to God. during the whole of the day, and even during prayer, when it may suffice to occupy those souls who feel its attraction and are vouchsafed the grace and who love to stand before God " simply attentive to His holy presence in prayer"; *Conf,* ii, vol. VI, p. 29.
9 St.]ohn of the Cross demands as a basis for this prayer a certain degree of contemplation. See p. 832 St. Francis was not acquainted with this doctor's work, but is in practical agreement with him.
,0 *Conf.,* XVI11 (end).

between meditation and the liturgical Divine Office. He guided his daughters in the way of prayer without exempting them from the traditional monastic practices, and especially office in choir L

The canonical liturgy is the normal complement of meditation.· it results from a *contemplative inclination* to give to God solemn adorations, praise and prayer; nor can it truly bear its fruits save in those souls that are really convinced of the grandeur of God and of His goodness and mercy2, and who, in very deed, are united to Him by a suffiçently perfect activity of faith, hope, and charity. And since these virtues produce a certain real unity of thought and feeling with God 3, they give unity to the varied prayers and formulas that make up the office. Subjects of meditation are therefore not needful during the recitation of the office4, but rather opportunities to kindle the thought and love of God, just as a soul filled with hope and charity easily rises to the thought of the Creator when engaged in exterior works. The material form of the office serves the same purpose5, but what is really important is a close union with God. The latter becomes much easier and perfect, provided that the gifts of understanding and wisdom are granted to the soul, either to take the place of the understanding of the words6 or make it easier. Regarded in this waj the divine office becomes a true prayer, possessing unity and simplicity and great moral efficacy7. It is an *active fortn of contemplation* and every religious is bound to practise it in some measure8.

St. Francis is also a man of tradition on account of the importance he gives to the sacraments 9, especially the

---

1 Unlike St. Ignatius who did not put this obligation on his religious. This step raised a long and grave discussion on the importance of the office and liturgy in general to the Christian life. Cf. F. Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 9S-149.

1 This deep conviction of God's perfections is obtained either by devout and meditative *leadings* performed in the manner of the early monks, or by the modern practice of *prayer,* or yet again and this is the best way, by the *gifts* of the Holy Ghost, particularly the higher ones. These latter, however, rarely develop normally save in souls trained in recollection by means of the devout meditations we have mentioned.

3 The office, therefore, understood in this way, is not a diffuse prayer.

4 The majority of these passages are very suggestive; meditation however must come first, so that its fruits may be found in the office. Rapid recitation may hinder meditation, but not the *savouring* of the truths that are set out. St. Francis asks Philothea *[hitrod.,* 11, c. 1) to "*savour* the admirable and delicious meaning" of the prayers he prescribes for her.

5 That is why it has been possible to impose it even on nuns who know no Latin. St. Francis counsels them to be ""simply attentive to God". *Conf.,* xvili; vol. vi, p. 345-346. This method may be compared with the above mentioned simplified prayer.

6 For those who do not understand them, or who, understanding them, are not actually attentive to the words, but fix their attention generally on God.

7 It is a pure practice of the highest Christian virtues, and especially the love of God, the crown and source of all the virtues.

8 All priests also, since the Church obliges them to say the office.

' See F. Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 373"396·

Holy Eucharist and penance x. He had to work in an unfavourable atmosphere. Worldy humanism jeered at these sacred rites while the bold denials of the Protestants had injected their poison even into Catholic circles. Catholics reacted by preaching and urging *frequent communion* and confession 23 The Jesuits were the most zealous campaigners. St. Francis of Sales was entirely in accord with them and worked harder than anyone to build up a movement of piety that had been so long delayed but never completely arrested by Jansenism. Despite practical precautions which now seem exaggerated 3, he was a convinced believer in frequent communion (weekly) 4 and persuaded his penitents to receive the Body of Our Lord very often. He was insistent on the subjective conditions of purity and fervour that give greater efficacy to the sacrament. These dispositions he desired also in the sacrament of *penance,* which is of course meant to forgive past sins, but should also provide the soul with weapons of grace and strength for the futures. In these observations it is easy to perceive that eminent moralist, the Bishop of Geneva 69

The asceticism of St. Francis of Sales has made popular in the Church certain spiritual practices that may be termed supplementary practices. They are very characteristic of his method : I. *Ejaculatory ■prayerl* is a short heartfelt invocation, frequently renewed by pious souls throughout the day. It is suggested by a thousand different objects and especially by the beauties of nature which reflect the beauty of God. These ejaculations are a continuation of true prayer and may sometimes take its place ; without them " we cannot live a contemplative" life really well, and we make but a poor business of the active tife". 2. He prescribes the *examination of conscience*^ but without all the precision given to it by' others10. "St. Francis has chosen a middle way between the free spontaneity of the Franciscans and the methodical

1 Which have been called the "sacraments of preservation"; *ibid.,* p. 373.

3 Altar rails and confessionals are found in churches since the XVIth century.

3 Due to the prejudices and customs prevalent in the XVIth century.

4 He nevertheless allowed St. Jeanne de Chantal to communicate daily—an unheard of thing at that time. He was used to insist on freedom from any inclination to venial sin *{Introd.,* II, c. 20); but elsewhere *(ibid.,* c. 21) he called to the heavenly banquet the perfect and imperfect, the strong and the weak, the sick and the well.

5 *Intiod.,* H, c. 19.

6 M. Vincent *top. cit.),* brings out this aspect of St. Francis' teaching by looking on the sacraments as " auxiliary means to culture ".

I F. Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 345-355· Ejaculatory prayer "is indeed the great originality' of our saint " says this author, p. 347.

Il *Introd.,* II, c. 13.

9 *ibid.,* c. 11. .45

10 Mainly St. Ignatius Loyola and M. Tronson.

spirit of St. Ignatius"[1].* He gives a greater place to the affections than to self-examination, and dwells on the future rather than on the past[3]. 3. An *annual retreat* is prescribed[3] for devout persons and this includes layfolk. For several days they should recollect themselves, examine how far they have advanced in the way of the love of God, and renew their resolutions[4]. 4. *Spiritual direction* is counselled to Philothea from the outset[5]: St. Francis of Sales is eager to forestall all the aberrations of individual inspiration. He desires the director to subordinate his influence to God's, to adapt his guidance to the natural temperament of his penitent and make progress gradually; direction should be mild and supple, indirect and comprehensive, tending in every way to the love of God [6,7]

4. The virtues, as may be supposed, occupy a great place in the spirituality of this great moralist. His very method tends to throw them into relief, for his optimism inclined him to strive with vice less by means of direct attack than by the development of the contrary virtue and the growth of the love of God. In this manner he also causes mortification to be loved, yet it cannot be said that he tempers Christian austerity. He has been called, on the contrary, " the most mortifying of all the saints " ", at least in the sense that he obtains, through love, the sacrifices that others obtain only by means of rigid commandments.

He knew how to adapt the practice of virtue to all sorts and conditions of men : the ideal of perfection he gives to the laity[8] is not that he holds up to religious[9]. He is not a narrow-minded ascetic; he pays attention to the whole man, neglecting neither learning nor art, nor the ornaments of the mind, nor the human affection that animates the heart, nor the health that gives beauty to the body[10]. Yet while training the man, he never loses sight of the Christian and constantly disciplines the faculties by means of the Christian virtues. This purpose, already very apparent in the *Introduction,* is almost predominant in the *Conferences.* The characteristic of the Order he founded, is not austerity, but love; "the fervour of charity and the strength of a very intimate devotion " ".

[1] F. Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 372.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 363-373.

[3] *Introd.,* vth P.» c. 1-16. This should be distinguished from the "spiritual retreat" mentioned above (ilnd P., c. 12) which signifies recollection.

[4] All the latter part of the *Introduction* deals with this subject.

[5] *Introd.,* 1st. P., c. 4.

[6] F. Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 397-5'5-

[7] M. Olier. See his *lie,* Paris, 1841 (vol. 11, p. 1S0).
See the lllrd P., of the *Introduction to the Devout Life.*

[9] See *Spiritual Conferences.*

[ó] F. Vincent, *op. cit.,* p. 217-290.

[«] Addition to the 1st constitution. Cf. Preface to the *Conferences,* p. XXX.

This gentle force of love should lead the nun to practice the great virtues of her state of life[1] — object of the three vows — according to their spirit; entire detachment from self, modesty, the flower of chastity, and renunciation of her own will. The first conferences lay the foundations of this spirit and end with three typical rules: confidence, generosity, unruffled humour[2]. This ideal finds its perfect realisation only in the purest love of God.

C) The Love of God and Salesian mysticism.

Charity finds in devotion the generous impulse that makes the soul serve God happily, without regrets. Its perfection, however, dwells in the purity and intensity of the *interior acts* by which the soul is directly united to God. In order that it may produce these acts, splendid aids are vouchsafed to it; these are the *mystical graces.* St. Francis of Sales deals with these acts and graces in the three books (V-VII) that form the very heart of the work and contain all the essentials of his mystical theology. The four books that follow, form a necessary supplement, since the *fruits* of perfect love (bk. VIII-IX) and their *qualities* (bk. X-XI) allow the author to set out a noble asceticism, instinct with mysticism. This ascetic teaching is of great and unequalled practical importance for all, and especially for those souls whom God calls to perfection.

I. The interior acts that constitute the very essence of love and unite the soul to God are complacency and benevolence, treated in bk. V. *a)* By *complacency*[3] the soul rejoices in the divine perfections and rests in them so as to enjoy them; this repose does not consist in the absence of activity but in "having no need for activity" since the soul finds all its needs in God[4]. But love, even though it has found what it sought, still continues to seek, not perhaps

[1] *Conf.*, II-VII: confidence, firmness, cordiality, generosity, hope, the great spiritual laws.

[2] *Conf.*, VII.

[3] *Love of God,* bk. V, c. 1-5.

[4] *Ibid.*, c. 3. A very important remark for the understanding of Salesian contemplation, which remains active even when perfect: we make our way towards a garden, and having arrived there continue to walk, the better to enjoy it "We always seek the one we always love" says the great St. Augustine, "love seeks what it has found, not in order to have it, but in order to have it always". *Ibid.*, ch. 3, p. 267.

to acquire more, but to enjoy what it has. *b) Benevolence*[1]2 is for us a result of complacency. God on the contrary, begins by manifesting His benevolence to his creatures, and then delights in His work. Benevolence mainly consists in desires to please and be useful, in an urgent need to praise God and cause Him to be praised by all creatures.

The *practice of these acts* is the main motive for the *prayer* that is described at the beginning of book VIa. By prayer the Saint means meditation and contemplation which should be carefully distinguished. *Meditation* " is no other than an attentive thought deliberately repeated or nourished in the mind with a view to stirring the will to holy affections and resolutions"[3]. "Contemplation is no other than a loving, simple and constant attention of the mind to divine things"[4]. This latter and nobler form of prayer differs from meditation inasmuch as it implies love instead of seeking to find it[5]; it gazes on its object with a simple and general rather than an analytical regard[6]. And lastly, it takes place effortlessly and pleasurably, since it is an effect of love[7]. The contemplation here described is a *distinct* contemplation : it implies either a simple view of a single divine perfection, or a general view of several divine perfections, or again, the fixing of the attention on some divine work or activity[8], thus allowing the soul to produce the interior acts of complacency and benevolence without any discursive effort[9]. We have here in reality, a simple but *active* and nearly perfect *contemplation.*

2. The mystical graces are linked up with the practice of the contemplation just described. The part played by love is strongly marked. St. Francis here follows in the footsteps of St. Teresa, but with a master's assurance. He does not hesitate to see things from his own viewpoint. *a)* The prayers previous to the union[10] retain the same name given to them by the holy Carmelite : I. *recollection* 11 is described by means of the same comparisons and

1 *I.ove of God,* bk. V, c. 6-12.

2 *Ibid.,* bk. vi, 1-6. Prayer, to the author's mind, is the same as mystical theology.

3 *Ibid.,* c. 2. — 4 *Ibid.,* c. 3.

5 " In a word, meditation is the mother of love, but contemplation is its daughter". *Ibid.,* c. 3, p. 313.

6 *Ibid., c.* 5. — 7 *Ibid.,* c. 6.

8 These "three manners" in which "lhe simple view of contemplation takes place" are indicated at the beginning of c. 6, *ibid.*

9 St. John of lhe Cross allows discursive reasoning to be left off only when human activity is replaced by a general and indistinct view of God, produced by the Holy Ghost (at least inceptive infused contemplation). St. Francis does not go contrary to this and his practical teaching finds its explanation in the principle laid down by the Spanish doctor, who gives not only a practical but also a theological explanation. The two doctors supplement each other. When St. Francis of Sales wrote the *Treatise* he was not acquainted with St. John's works, printed in 1618.

10 *Love of God,* bk. VI, c. *'I-w. — Ibid.,* c. 7.

a number of others; 2. *quietude*[1] " or the soul's repose in its well-beloved " is studied at great length and found to be very similar to the "sleep of the faculties "[2]. *b)* St. Francis does not classify the prayers of Union in generala by means of special names but by their characteristic effects. He ascribes to them " *the flowing of the soul into God*", since during these prayers the soul takes such delight in God " that it flows gently, like something fluid and liquid, into the Divinity that it loves "[4]. During the same prayer there takes place "a kind of liquefaction of the soul in God "[5], according to the words of the Canticle: "Anima mea liquefacta est ut locutus est". (órz/z/., v, 6). Love, fruit of complacency, produces other great effects in the soul, kindling the most pure sentiments, even to the *wound of love* :[6] the latter is a result of the sacrifices exacted by love, the burning desires it elicits and the attractions of God[7]; one poignant effect of its purest forms is "the loving langour of a heart wounded by love "[8].*

Other effects of union, especially intense union, are explained in book vu. And here again the holy Doctor is careful not to rule out a certain activity *of* the soul. The soul must not simply lean on Godas does the vine on the elm, but should cling to Him with all its strength as ivy clings to the tree: "It so presses against them and embraces, them that it even pierces and enters their bark"'. This union takes place mainly *during prayer*[10]*as do also the eminent *effects* of the mystical graces. St. Francis mentions three chief effects : *ecstasies* (or *ravishments}, life* in God and the death caused by love.

Ecstasies are of three kinds " : ecstasy of the understanding resulting from wonder at the divine truth : ecstasy *of* the will resulting from loving complacency in God's goodness; ecstasy of action. This latter is the only one necessary and the best criterion of the two preceding ones[12], yet it is not an ecstasy in the true sense of the word. The two former alone are commonly known as ecstasies or raptures, but self deception must be guarded against. In consecpience the author, after having described[13] them gives the signs of true rapture'[14] *a}* it "never lays hold of, or attaches itself to the understanding so much as to the will"'[15] and this is to be said even of the first kind which contains

1 *Ibid.,* c. 8-11. — 2 *Ibid.,* c. 8. — 3 *Ibid.,* c. 12-13. — 4 *ibid.,* c. 12.
s *ibid.,* c. 12. — 6 *Ibid.,* c. 13-15. — 7 *Ibid., c.* 13. — 8 *Ibid.,* c. 15.
' *Lave of God,* bk. vn, c. 1. — 10 *Ibid.,* c. 1-3. — " *Ibid.,* c. 4.
12 *Ibid.,* c. 6. St. Teresa speaks in the same fashion in the vnth Mansion. See above, p. 823. — 13 *Ibid., c.* 4 and 5. — M *Ibid.,* c. 6.
15 St. Teresa seems to give quite a contrary criterion : " If the soul does not sometimes understand these secrets, there is no rapture" *{Castle,* vi, c. 4); but thereby she wanted to separate ecstasy from simple quietude and still more from vulgar physical weaknesses (see p. 819). St. Francis, on the contrary, was solicitous to distinguish religious rapture from the natural rapture of philosophers and artists.

more of light, of wonder, than the other, *If* it is combined with activity, as has been said.

Life in God. in ecstatic love' and finally death through love' give rise to splendid developments that offer no particular difficulty. These effects are among the greatest produced by the mystical graces. St. Francis, who does not refer to the *transforming union,* no doubt describes some of its qualities here. The others are to be found in the more general fruits of perfect love described in the following books.

3. Perfect love is recognised *even outside prayer* by the fruits it bears in the will, and by its qualities. By FRUITS [3] we understand the *permanent effects* of God's love on the will: they are constant dispositions that guarantee the supernatural value of this love. In prayer they may and should be translated in feeling, but must subsequently show themselves in action.

There are two principal fruits of love: 1. *conformity* to the will of God[4]; an effect of complacency and benevolence[5], which favourably disposes the human will to perform positive acts that may be asked by God[6] not only by His commandments[7] but also in counsels[8] or simple inspirations[9].* 2. *Submission to the good will of God*'° is but another form of the same union of the human will to God's will, inasmuch as God asks the acceptation of suffering or privation. This acceptation must transcend patience and resignation [11] and reach the point of *holy indifference,*™, even in spiritual matters'[3]. Such indifference is a real death of the soul and results in total self-renunciation'[4].

The following qualities may be ascribed to all love of God, but they have their consummation only in perfect love: I. God must be loved *"before all things* ' *[5]: such is His command which may be kept with varying degrees of perfection [16], and very excellently by zeal for the salvation of our neighbour '7; 2. *God's love* is all embracing [18]: it perfects and contains all the virtues, even the noblest '9, and also repairs the ruin caused by sin [20]. We should therefore " reduce all the practice of virtue and actions to holy[7] love " [2I]. Love contains the gifts of the Holy Ghost[22] and transforms

[1] *ibid.,* c. 7-8. — [3] *Ibid.,* c. 9-14.

[3] This may be compared with what St. Thomas says of the *fruits* of the Holy Ghost or *perfect acls;*\\\ reality, however, they are treating different subjects; even their viewpoints are divergent.

[4] *Lave of God,* all of bk. Vili. — [5] *Ibid.,* c. 1-2. — [6] *Ibid,* c. 3-4.

[7] *Ibid,* c. 5. — [8] *Ibid.,* c. 6-9. — [9] *Ibid,* c. 10-13.

[10] *Ibid.,* the whole of bk. IX. — " *Ibid,* c. 1-3. — '= *Ibid,* c. 4.

'[3] *Ibid.,* c. 5-10. — [14] *Ibid,* c. 11-16. — *[5] *Ibid.,* bk. X (entirely).

[16] *Ibid.,* c. 4-5. — [17] *Ibid.,* c. II-17. — ,[8] *Ibid.,* bk. Xi (entirely).

'[5] *Ibid.,* c. 1-9. — [80] *Ibid,* c. 10-12. — [81] *Ibia.,* c. 13-14· — [93] *Ibid,* c. 15.

fear1; it has within it the fruits of the Holy Ghost and the beatitudes 2;„ it governs "all the passions and affections of the soul 3 and drives out sadness which " is almost always useless and contrary to the service of divine love'G. St. Francis interest in moral theology led him to add to his long explanation a number of *practical counsels* " for the advancement of the soul in divine love "5. J-Ie recommends the forming of an explicit intention 6;* the offering up of ones actions /, and ends by showing that "Mount Calvary is the real school of divine love"8.

As a moralist St. l· rancis of Sales thus leads his disciple to a harmonious development of all the faculties, by subordinating them to the noble life of the mind and will, a life that is wholly dominated by an enlightened, active and burning love of God. *Humanism* and *mysticism* combine together in this teaching, yet it is not humanism that has flowered in a mystical blossom; not human culture which has, by its own powers, brought the love of God to perfection. Rather is it that man by dying to himself and renouncing all things has come to the highest peak of love where he finds his whole perfection. Thus, no matter how much they are opposed to each other in appearance, mysticism far from destroying the work of humanism, completes and consummates it.

' *Ibid.,* c. 16-18. — 3 *Ibid., c.* 19. — 3 c. 2o. — 4**Ibid., c.* 21.
s *Lmc of God,* all book Xi I. — 6 *Ibid.,* c. 8. — 7 *Ibid., c. g. — p Ibid., c.* tj·

CONCLUSION.

It has been our intention to make known the Fathers and their great continuators. The *Fathers,* that is to say the early ecclesiastical writers, and especially those who have owed to their genius, their outstanding gifts and their holiness an indisputable authority as masters of Christian thought; in brief, the Doctors. *Their great continuators,* that is to say the theologians or spiritual teachers who in their own manner recast or reproduced the traditional truth handed down from the ancients before passing it on to posterity, both during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. And of these, we have dwelt with more care on the greatest, those who have also been honoured with the title of *Doctorl.* We have brought our study to an end with St. Francis of Sales who fitly closes this period.

Any direct comparison between the works of modern masters and the earlier writers, especially those of the first centuries, is generally impossible, so great are the contrasts. Yet a twofold danger is to be avoided here. First, the stressing of differences to the point *of* affirming a revolution. There have, no doubt, been revolutions; but the works that gave rise to them were not long in incurring condemnation, and their history is that of the heresies. In this work we have dealt only with the writings of masters whose thought was in line with Catholic tradition and who have done something to elucidate it. For this very reason, and here is the other danger, one may be tempted, the better to isolate a common teaching, to overlook divergences, sometimes striking ones, which are the natural consequence of a

l The actual number of Doctors of the Church is 26, of whom the most part belong to Christian antiquity, i. e., ‹? *Orientals:* St. Athanasius, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and St. John Chrysostom, called " the great Doctors of the East ", to whom are added St. Ephraem, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Cyril of Alexandria and St. John Damascene; ‹7 *Latins:* St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great, called "the great Doctors of the West ", to whom are added, St. Hilary, St. Leo, St. Peter Chrysologus, St. Isidore and St. Bede. In the period posterior to the Fathers we have 9 other Doctors in the West, 5 in the Middle Ages: St. Peter Damian, St. Anselm, St. Bernard, St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas Aquinas; 4 in recent times: St. John of the Cross, St. i'eter Canisius, St. Francis of Sales, St. Alphonsus Liguori.

justifiable and necessary evolution, both from a doctrinal and literary viewpoint, in this lies a risk of taking away all originality both from the men and their doctrines. As may easily be supposed, the same danger is present with respect to modern authors and schools. We have made a real effort to avoid these perils, by maintaining an intermediary position, while stressing the points which best characterise each author. Between the Fathers and the medieval doctors there is evidently continuity. No Catholic can doubt it, nor have we attempted to prove it, taking it absolutely for granted in the title of Book IV. This affirmation, though self evident, appeared to us to have its uses. In the developments of each chapter we have mainly endeavoured to throw light on the special qualities of these more recent works.

These usually stand apart from the early writings, as we have said above (see p. 352) by reason of a certain systematisation, either because their subject matter is more clearly defined or because the more speculative method they employ makes a greater use of philosophy, or yet again because the individual genius of some great mind influences an important group of writers and thus forms a school of thought. The Schools of theology and spirituality that share the allegiance of the majority of contemporary Catholic thinkers arose during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Those who remain independent of any school are rare. The founders or first masters of the Schools are thus, in a sense, the distant but nevertheless influential inspirera of modern Catholic thought. The advantages of the detailed study we have given them are thus apparent. Their successors do little more than follow in their footsteps and it suffices, for the most part, to attach them to a school in order to know the essential elements of their teaching.

Three schools above all are paramount in theology, those of St. Thomas, Duns Scotus and Suarez. They have not diminished in vigour since the XVIth century and each can shew a glorious line of venerable doctors [1].

The xvnth century witnessed a brilliant dowering of the Scotist school[2], especially among the Observants and the Conventuals who

[1] See for all these authors Hurter, *Nomenclator,* vol. ni-v. A. Tanquerey mentions the chief ones in his *Synopsis theologia dogmatica:,* vol. II, 1926 (20th ed.), p 31-67 *{Brevis historia theologia dogm.,* art. Ill, actas moderna). de Vulf, *Hist. ph. mid.,* 11, p. 27850. See *Diet, théol.,* art. *Frères Mineurs,* col. 840-862.

were more on their guard against eclecticism than the other Franciscans. They were tobe found in every country and all the chief universities. We may mention François Hauzeiir (ci. 1676), Fr. Macedo (d. i68iy, Brancati de Lam ia (d. 1682), Cl. Frassen (cl. 1711), Bart. Durand (d. 1720).

No less striking was the success of the masters of the Society of Jesusl who usually took their inspiration from Suarez, but without slavishness and with a real independence of outlook. We may recall the names of A. Tanner (cl. 1623), M. de Ripalda (d. 1648), Cl. Tiphanius (d. 1641) Ruys de Montoya (cl. 1632) and especially Lugo (d. 1660) as famous for dogma as for moral ; the latter was given special attention by P. Laymann (d. 1635), H. Busenbaum (cl. 1668;, A. de Escobar (d. 1669), Cl. Lacroix (d. 1714), who were the true forerunners of St. Alphonsus.

The Thomist schools2, in its turn, can put forward the three very-great names of John of St. Thomas (d. 1644) V. Contenson (d. 1764), J. Gonet (d. 1681), A. Goudin (d. 1695), A. Massoulié (d. 1706), Noël Alexandre (d. 1724), Ch. R. Billuart (d. 1757) with whom must be associated the Carmelite theologians of Salamanca (Salmanticenses) who worked for nearly 50 years on their famous *Cursus theologicus.*

In these last centuries there are certainly to be found theologians of merit not belonging to these schools, either seculars or religious of Orders other than the teaching Orders we have mentioned, and even members of the latter who have followed a personal line of thought. It nevertheless remains indisputable that all, in varying degrees, have been subject to the influence of the above schools. One of the latter, in the course of the XIXth century, especially since Leo XIII, has made a considerable advance on the others, due to the fact that St. Thomas has been officially given to the Seminaries and Universities as the master in philosophy and theology 3, and because the Church seems to be insisting on a strict interpretation 4 of the works of the Angelic Doctor without, however, making them absolutely obligatory 5. We, therefore, have considered it our duty in this Manual to deal more fully with the life, teaching and writings of St. Thomas, the unrivalled Master in theology.

The name of Saint Augustine, whose influence we have found present in all the great intellectual movements in the West since the early Middle Ages has been less to the fore

1 See *Did. thiol.*, art. *Jésuites,* col. 1043-1092.
3 See *Did. thiol.,* art. *Frères Prêcheurs,* col. 914-924.
3 See p. 540, 634.
4 See for instance the decree of the Congregation of Studies on the 24 Thomist theses, July 27, 1914.
5 See X. Le Bachelet, Jésuites, in *Did. thiol.,* col. 1038-1043 (Recent instructions).

in modern times. He was to some extent unhappily discredited by the abuse of his teaching made by his sectarian disciples, the Jansenists, who fathered on him their narrow-mindedness.

"Offspring of Baianism, Jansenism[1] is a singular heresy that has always aspired to remain in the Church, despite reiterated condemnations by the Holy See. This claim is still very evident among the rare heirs of Jansenist thought who are now rapidly disappearing. Two main phases may be perceived in the course of its history: in the first, Jansenism was primarily a theological system of grace and predestination; the controversies, very lively as a rule, were usually doctrinal. Animated, as were so many Christians at the time, with a real zeal for reform, a certain number of believers thought to help on the great work by reviving in the dogmatic field a number of obsolescent theses that they claimed to be St. Augustine's, and, in the practical field of Christian life, certain penitential uses dating from the first Christian centuries. The *Augustinus**, resuscitated the former, while the latter were presented with rare talent in the book of *Frequent Communion*[3]. Thus the great names of Jansenius and Arnauld dominated all the period that ended with the peace of *Clement IX* (1669). During the second phase, Jansenism became an opposition political party, parlementarían and philosophico-religious" during a "period that began in the last years of XVIIth century and endured with contrasts of unheard of violence and periods of relative calm until the Revolution"[4]. The first Jansenism alone offers us any real theological interest. Its doctrine, as is well known, teaches that mankind is deeply corrupted and altered by original sin, and especially that resistance to grace is impossible; grace imposes itself by means of a victorious delectation just as sin is forced on man by carnal delectation without any hope of his resistance[5]. Such is the system, based on the denial of free-will, which has only too well deserved the charge *of pessimism*. This charge is sometimes made against St. Augustine himself, because his main theses have been forgotten: these latter and in particular his comforting teaching on wisdom form the basis of a true supernatural optimism[6].

2. Schools were formed not only in dogmatic and moral theology but also in spirituality. Insistence on some special aspect or element of Christian life provides the basis for such a classification which, as we have seen, is already to be found in medieval authors. The splendid precision given by Renaissance writers on spirituality both to the

[1] J. CARREYRE, Jansénisme, in *Dict. théol.*, col. 318-529.

[2] Jansenius' work (d. 1638), (*Ibid.*, col. 319-329) published two years after his death, 1640.

[3] Antoine Arnauld's work (1612-1694) appeared in 1643.

[4] J. Carreyre, *ibid.*, col. 318.

[5] This teaching is found in the *Augustinus*. See detailed precis of this work, *ibid.*, col. 330-448.

[6] See vol. I, p. 664. The revival of spiritual studies which is now taking place, affords hope of a fortunate reaction against these misunderstandings.

method of devout practices and to doctrinal explanations brought these systematisations into still greater favour. All recent writers have thus been advantageously classified as belonging to one or another of these schools:[1]* the number of those who remain independent of these excellent groupings is extremely small. Nevertheless we must not regard these partitions as absolutely watertight. All writers, no matter to what school they belong, admit the doctrine of the others, despite their own special preferences. The masters of the XVIth century with whom we have dealt, St. Ignatius, St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, St. Francis of Sales, remain for all the classical teachers, the doctors of asceticism and mysticism.

New spiritual groups have of course arisen since then, founded by godly men, and by saints. Yet, in general, these have added but little that is new to the great classical works. They have simply based their work on some great truth that has impressed them particularly.

Thus, Cardinal de Bertille[3] (d.1629) particularly insisted on the virtue of religion, so engrossed was he by the "*grandeurs*" of Jesus, the *Incarnate Word,* for whom he had a burning love. The Oratorian school, represented by Condren (d. 1641) and Bourgoing (d. 1662), and Thomassin in theology, carried on his traditions.

Very close to the above school is the school of Saint Sulpice, founded by M. Olier[3] and continued mainly by M. Tronson; it teaches, in addition to the spirit of religion, interior abnegation, with a view to perfect "adherence" to the *interior feelings of Christ,* which form their favourite subject of meditation.

Another of Bérulle's disciples, St. Eudes[4], fostered the *devotion to the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary,* a devotion which owes to St. Marguerite Marie and Bl. de la Colombière[5] a magnificent influence in modern Christian life. St. Paul of the Cross particularly spread the devotion to the Passion, and Bl. Grignon of Montfort that of Our Lady.

Several saints, founders of other important religious groups, St. Vincent de Paul, (d. 1660), St. John Baptiste de la Salle (d. 1719) St. Alphonsus Liguori (d. 1787) had mainly *practical ends*[6] in view and diew their

[1] See especially the general bibliography placed at the beginning of A. Tanquerey's *Précis de théologie ascétique et mystique,* p. XXXIII-XLVIII, for the modern period.

[3] See especially H. Bremond, *Hist. litt. du sentiment rel.,* vol. III. *L'Ecole française,* p. 3-221. P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* vol. III, p. 491 sq.

[3] See H. Bremond, *ibid.,* p. 419 507. P. Pourrat, *ibid.,* p. 526-567.

[4] H. Bremond, p. 58359. P. Pourrat, *ibid.,* p. 586-596. Cf. J. Boilay, *Vie,* Paris, 1903-1908. Cil. LEBRUN, *Le bx Eudes et le culte op. du S. C.,* Paris, 1917.

[5] J. Bainvel, *La dév. au Sacré-Cœur de J.,* Paris, 1917 (4th ed.)

[6] For all these authors sec P. Pourrat, *op. cit.,* vol. IV.

teaching from the masters we have already mentioned. The spiritual life, of course, continued its growth after the latter had gone, but benefited by their talents. The authors we have studied as far as St. Francis of Sales do not represent the end of a series, but should rather be looked upon as pioneers.

Their influence has been far-reaching. The supernatural charm and warm conviction of St. Teresa's descriptions of the graces of prayer won over many adherents to mysticism and dealt a death blow to the teachings of the false reformers, while the gentleness of St. Francis of Sales decided those who still hesitated. Yet among these disciples there were some who, like the *Alumbrados,* fell victims to alien influences and wandered from the right path, ending up with an heretical quietism or an uncertain semi-quietism.

These excesses had the effect of reviving the doubts and fears of the ascetics, all the more so inasmuch as the new asceticism, given fresh life by the invention of precise methods, seemed capable of leading souls to the highest summits. Jansenist tendencies, filtering into intellectual circles, did little to help souls to expand and added to the seriousness of the controversy. The harassing of Molinos and the delation of Fençlon's semi-quietism revealed all the bitterness of the opposition[1] Since that time a good many minds harbour a certain distrust of mysticism whose object they are coming to consider as more and more extraordinary.

Since the beginning of the XXth century[2] war has been waged against these narrow opinions and the essential mystical graces are gradually being recognised as necessary auxiliaries of the perfect life. This conception also appears to us to be more in harmony with the early and particularly the medieval tradition, especially the Augustinian tradition. Yet for a better understanding of it, we must insist more than is usually done in these days, on an important aspect of the mystical graces : their possible co-existence in certain conditions with a tranquil and moderate activity of the mind. Although St. Teresa's splendid descriptions have served since the xvith century to draw the attention of theologians and spiritual teachers to the *passive* aspect of the mystical graces and though her teaching enjoys indisputable authority, it nevertheless remains useful and even necessary to recall the other active element of contemplative and even supernatural contemplation, a viewpoint that is more familiar to Augustinians \ Far from being rendered obsolete by the

[1] In this place we can do no more than give passing mention to the controversy, which caused a great stir in Europe and brought to grips, on one of lhe most delicate of theological matters, i. e., the nature of pure love, Fenelon, brilliant protagonist of a subtle and ardent mysticism, and Bossuet, eager to defend faith, hope and charity, the foundation of Christian life, which he thought to be in danger and which he opportunely reiterated to be the radical basis of all mysticism.

[3] See above, p. 362.

[1] See General Introduction, vol. I, p. 19-20.

precise additions of the new doctors, the teaching of the early masters may often contribute indirectly to solve modern difficulties \ And in reality there is no doubt that this theory of a wisdom that is both active and supernatural has more than merely historic interest. The works on spirituality to which it serves as a key have a universal application and arc timeless. Their teaching, furthermore, has the advantage of sensibly attenuating the doctrinal opposition in which the mystical and ascetic movements of our times have become rooted?. St. Augustine s modernity is thus made more apparent3.

3. The great fact on which we love to dwell, however, is the flood of light thrown on that continuity of life, always the same, though differing in manner, which unites the authors of the first centuries and their distant spiritual heirs in one community of thought and feeling. It is the ever present story of the grain of mustard seed that becomes a great tree. If progress is possible in dogmatic matters, how much more so must we admit it in spirituality where the part played by experience is greater; yet even here, the advance must go on *Z/z eodem sensu eademque sententia.* Hence the enormous interest in finding in the writings of our Fathers the principles which control such a growth.

This continuity which we have not explicitly underlined in the pages of this *Manual* may possibly have been evident with each succeeding chapter and may possibly be regarded as one of the more outstanding qualities of this work.

We like to believe, however, that the best part of this *Manual Wq s* rather in the somewhat ample doctrinal explanations which supplement the description of the lives and writings of the great churchmen. Christian writings, more than any other literary work, are radiant with the wealth of doctrine they contain. Style, no doubt, has its importance. The centuries of great culture during which Christian thinkers gave more refinement to their style tend to rivet the attention. Yet they should not be allowed to make us overlook or despise the others, which handed on no less exactly the sacred deposit of revelation. In these matters, art comes after divine truth which should be the main preoccupation of any Christian author who desires to speak and write as a Christian. And, by truth, we understand not only dogma

' See F. Ca YRÉ, *Maîtres anciens et problèmes modernes en spiritualité,* in *Vie Spirit.*, 1930, Jan., vol. 22, p. [12X24].

= See above, p. 362.

I See E. Gil s o n, *Introduction à l étude de S. Attinsiin,* París, 1929.

as such, but all revealed data on which are based Christian life and piety.

Our insistence on spiritual teaching has given us a special opportunity to throw into relief the successive embellishments that the saints have given to the divine words concerning the indwelling of Cod in holy souls and His manner of communicating with them. They thus provide us with rules concerning religious feeling in which so much interest is justly shewn in our limes. Yet all feeling of this kind is not by any means authentically divine mysticism'. It is, therefore, all the more necessary that we should have a sure criterion for distinguishing the latter from its counterfeits : we find it in the writings of the masters whose authority the Church has recognised and who have described it in so many different ways -. Some acquaintance with these authors is an absolute necessity. The present work may at least serve as a guide to them and provide a summary outline of their teachings.

In the course of our doctrinal explanations we have met with very many tendencies and schools that stand clearly apart from others. Yet we have been careful not to oppose them one to the other, but simply to shew how each, in its own way, has earnestly sought truth in matters left free to discussion. And these matters are few in reality. Regarded as a whole, this history of the masters of Christian thought is a luminous history of truth, of its progress, its difficulties perhaps, but also of its victories. From one angle it is wholly divine. It is also, as we have seen, very human in many respects. But by' writing mainly of the Doctors we have drawn the reader's attention to men whose countenance is lit with supernatural light. We have had no other desire than faithfully to reproduce their ideas, while letting ourselves be guided — and this was our deliberate purpose, so that if a single word of this study gives us the lie we withdraw it unreservedly — by the Church who possesses in this world the charism of truth, *charisma veritatis certum* 3 and by the pope, who, in this world, is its glorious custodian.

1 See above, p. 360.
a Ibid, y p. 364 sq.
3 St. IRENÆÜS, *Adv. hier.,* bk. IV, XXVI, 2.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX

OF AUTHORS STUDIED OR MENTIONED IN THE 1st AND 2nd VOLUMES[1]

A

Abelard, n, 416-421.
Abercius, 1, 154.
Abukara (Theodore), 11, 325.
Abraham of Ephesus, 11, 106.
Absalom of Saint Victor, II, 464.
Absamya, 1, 385.
Acacius, li, 61/
Acacius of Berea, 1, 494.
Acacius of Cesarea, 1, 316.
Acoemetæ, 11, 73.
Acephali, 11, 59.
Achillinus (Alexander), 11, 716.
Ads (apocryphal), I, 163-164.
Ads of the Martyrs, I, 289-290.
Ads of the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, I, 74.
Actistetae, 11, 59.
Adam, II, 674.
Adamantins, I, 195 and 287.
Adam Wodehan, II, 669.
Addai (Doctrine of), I, 164.
Antonio de Escobar, 11, 863.
Adimantius, 1, 623.
Ad Novatianum, I, 254 and 288.
Adoptianists, I, 175; II, 381.
Adrian, I, 498.
Adrian I, 11, 231 and 320.
Adrian 11, II, 380.
Adrian (monk), II, 273.
Ægidian School, 11, 640-641, 672.
Ægidius Colonna, 11, 639-641, 672.
Ælurus (Timothy), II, 64.
Æneas *of* Caza, 11, 104.
Æneas of Paris, II, 380.
Ælius, I, 315.
Agapitus (St.), ii, 151.
Agathangelus, 11, 119.
Agatho (St.), π, 298.
Agnoetæ, ii, 59.
Agobard, II, 383.
Alain de Lille, II, 465.
Alberic, II, 415.
Albert the Great (St.), II, 488-491 and 696.
Albert Pighius, 11, 735.
Alcuin, li, 375-376.
Aleatoribus (De), I, 288.
Alexander Achillinus, II, 716.
Alexander of Alexandria (St.) 1, 327.
Alexander of Alexandria, II, 669.
Alexander of Hales, 11, 491-494.
Alexander of Lycopolis, I, 369.
Alexander Noël, II, 863.
Alexander in, 11, 469.
Alexander v, 11, 669.
Alexandria (School of), I, 177 sq., and 297 sq.
Alexandrians, I, 172 and 297.
Alexandrians (Epistle to), I, 164.
Alfarabi, II, 497.
Al-Gazali, 11, 477.
Alkendi, 11, 477.
Allen (William), 11, 735.
Alphonsus de Castro, II, 736.
Alogi, I, 106 and 140.
Alphonsus Liguori, 11, 865.
Alphonsus Rodriguez (St.), 11, 801.
Alphonsus Rodriguez, II, 801.
Alumbrados, 11, 790.
Alvarez (Balthasar), II, 801.
Alvarez de Paz, 11, 801.
Alvarez (Diego), II, 750.
Alvarius Pelagius, 11, 684.
Alypius (St.), I, 610.
Amalarius of Metz, II, 683.
Amalricians, 11, 692.

[1] This is not an index of authors quoted, but of those dealt with in the Patrology. The names printed in *thick type* arc those of authors or writings to which a whole chapter is devoted.

Amaury de Bènes, II, 480.
Ambrose (St.) I, 520-547.
Ambrose, I, 279.
Ambrosius Catharinas, 11, 743.
Ambrosiaster, 1, 605.
Ammonias, 1, 279.
Ammonias of Alexandria, II, 102.
Ammonias Saccas, I, 169.
Ammon (St.), 1, 503.
Amphilochius of Iconium (St.), 1, 430.
Ananias the Armenian, 11, 118.
Anastasias 1, (St.), I, 516.
Anastasios 1 of Antioch, 11, 296.
Anastasias II, 11, 146.
Anastasias the Apocrisarius, II, 308.
Anastasias the Monk, 11, 308.
Anastasias Sinaita, 11, 296.
Anatolius, 1, 279.
Andrew (Acts of), 1, 163.
Andrew of Crete, 11, 292-293.
Andreas de Vega, 11, 737.
Angela of Foligno (St.), it, 700.
Anomoeans, I, 315.
Anselm of Canterbury (St.), 11, 394-412 and 695.
Anselm of Laon, 11, 415.
Anti-Latin polemists, 11, 690.
Antioch (School of), 1, 281 and 298-300.
Antiochus the Monk, 11, 324.
Antiochus of Ptolemais, 1, 494.
Antipater of Bostra, π, 105.
Antonius Andreae, II, 669.
Antony (St.), 1, 502.
Antony (Antoninus) of Florence (St.), 723 and 739.
Appelles, 1, 105.
Ap iraates (St.), I, 376-378.
Aphthardocetae, II, 59 and 65.
Apocalypses (apocryphal), 1, 55.
Apocalyptics, I, 692.
Apocrypha, 1, 156-165.
Apocrypha (Ethiopian), I, 55.
Apollinarius of Hierapolis, I, 135.
Apollinarius of Laodicea, I, 447-452.
Apollinarists, 1, 296 and 451.
Apollonius, I, 139.
Apollonius (Acts of), 1, 290.
Apologists, I, 108-114; 128-138.
Apophthegmata, I, 500.
Apostolic Brethren, 11, 692.
Apostolic Fathers, I, 31-37.
Apostles (Epistle of), 1, 164.
Apostles (Creed of), 1, 37-42.
Apringius, 11, 257.
Arabic Gospel, 1, 161.
Arabian Aristotelianism, 11, 476.
Arator, 11, 213.
Arbella (Chronicle of), 11, 114.
Arians, I, 295, 309-319.
Aristides, 1, in.
Aristo of Pella, 1, 112.
Arius, I, 313-314.
Armand of Beauvoir, II, 672.
Arnobius the Elder, 1, 270-271.
Arnobius the Younger, II, 174-175.
Arrabal (P.), 11, p. 767.
Artemon or Artemas, 1, 175.
Asclepius, u, 192.
Asterias of Amasea, I, 496.
Asterias of Cappadocia, 1, 315.
Athanasius (St.), 1, 336-351.
Athanasius (Creed of), 1, 349.
Athenagoras, I, 131.
Augustus Niphus, II, 716.
Augustine (S.), 1, 612-716.
Augustine (Hermits of St.), II, 804.
Augustinian School of Saint \zictor, II, 697-699.
Augustinians, n, 473-475, 487, 672-673.
Augustinus Triumphus, 11, 672, 683.
Aurelius, I, 610.
Auriol (Peter), n, 669.
Ausonius, I, 551.
Avicenna, II, 477.
Avicebron, 11, 478.
Averroes, 11, 477.
Averroists, 11, 479.
Avircius Marcellus (Refillation of Montanisin dedicated to), I, 139-
Avitus (St.), II, 209-210.
Azor (John) 11, 770.

B

Babai the Great, 11, 49-51.
Bacon (Francis), II, 674, 715.
Bacon (John), II, 674.
Bacon (Robert), II, 488.
Bacon (Roger), 11, 496-497.
Baconthorpe, II, 674.
Balai, I, 385.
Balthasar Alvarez, 11, 801.

Bandinelli (Orlando), II, 468.
Bannez (Dominic), 11, 749-750-
Baradai (Jacob), II, 70.
Bardesanes, 1, 376.
Barnabas (Acts of), 1, 164.
Barnabas (Epistle of St.), I, 78-79.
Barnabas (Gospel of St.) 1, 160.
Baronins (Card.), 11, 737.
Barsanuphius (St.), 11, in.
Bar-Sudailli, 1, 220.
Barsumas, 11, 48.
Bartholomew Durand, II, 863.
Bartholomew Medina, II, 747.
Bartholomew of Braga, II, 793.
Bartholomew (Gospel of), 1, 160.
Bartholomew (Passion of), I, 164.
Basil (St.), I, 406-415, 432 sq.
Basil ot Ancyra, I, 317.
Basil of Seleucia, 11, 105.
Basilides, I, 103.
Bastida (Fr. de la) II, 767.
Beatus, 11, 381.
Bede the Venerable (St.), II, 272-276.
Beghards, 11, 692.
Béguins, 11, 692.
Bellarmine (St. Robert), 11, 763-765.
Benedictine School, 11, 694-5.
Benedict, (St.) 11, 231-233.
Benedict Biscop, 11, 273.
Benedict of Assignana, II, 671.
Berengarius, 11, 387-389.
Bernard (St.) n, 421-442, 696.
Bernard of Auvergne *or of* Cler mont, il, 641.
Bernard of Chartres, II, 414, 480.
Bernard de la Traille, II, 637.
Bernard of Tours, II, 414, 480.
Bernardino of Siena (St.), 11, 723.
Bernard Silvestris, 11, 415.
Berno (St.), 11, 694.
Berthold of Mosburg, 11, 637.
Berti, II, 762.
Bertrand (St. Louis), 11, 788.
Bérulle, II, 865.
Bessarion, II, 690, 725.
Biel (Gabriel), h, 728.
Billuart, 11, 863.
Boethius, π, 217-221.
Bonaventure (St.), n, 497*526, 700.
Boniface (St.), I, 519.
Boniface 11, 11, 151.
Boniface vin, 11, 676-677.
Bono Pudicitice (De), I, 288.
Borromeo (St. Charles), If, 726.
Bourgoing, II, 865.
Bradwardine (Thomas), n, 667.
Bram mart (John), II, 674.
Brancati de Lauria,
Braulio (St.), 11, 267.
Brethren (Apostolic), II, 692.
Bridget of Sweden (St.), II, 697-
Brin cel, II, 669.
Brothers of Purity, 11, 477.
Bruno (Giordano), II, 715.
Burchard of Worms, 11, 467.
Buridan (John), 11, 667.
Burleigh (Walter), II, 669.
Busenbaum, 11, 863.

C

Caelestius, I, 391-393.
Caerularius (Michael), II, 386.
Caesarius of Arles (St.), 11, 199* 209.
Cainites, I, 104.
Caius, I, 139.
Cajetan, 11, 740-742.
Callistus, I, 223-224.
Callistus (Edict of), 226-229, 244.
Calvin, II, 723.
Campion (Bl. Edmund), 11, 735.
Canisius (St. Peter), II, 733.
Cano (Melchior), 11, 745-747.
Canons (Apostolic), 1, 372.
Canons (Ecclesiastical), 1, 372.
Cantor (Petrus), 11, 467.
Capistrano (St. John), 11, 723.
Cappadocian Fathers, 1, 406-447.
Capreolus of Carthage, 1, 610.
Capreolus (John), 11, 739.
Carpocrates, 1, 103.
Carpus, Papylus, Agathonice (Acts of), I, 290.
Carthusian School, II, 708.
Cassia, II, 294.
Cassian, I, 594-603.
Cassiodorus, 11, 221-225.
Catechism (Boman), II, 726.
Cathares, I, 254, 11, 480.
Catharinus (Ambrosius), II, 743.
Catherine of Siena (St.), II, 701-702.
Celestine (St.), I, 579.
Celsus, i, 98.

Centuriators of Magdeburg. II, 735.
Cerdo, I, 104.
Cerinthus, 1, 103.
Chapters (Three), 11, 82-83.
Charles Borromeo (St.), II, 726.
Charron (Pierre), 11, 725, 736.
Chartres (School of). 11, 414.
Chosrov, π, 118.
Christopher Soto, II, 747.
Chronicon Paschale, II, 282.
Chromatins of Aquilea, 1, 605.
Chronographer of the year 345, I, 568.
Chrysippus of Jerusalem, II, 106.
Cistercian School, II, 696.
Clapwell (Richard), II, 636.
Claude d'Espence, 11, 736.
Claude de Sainetes, II, 736.
Claudianus Mamertus, 11, 179-180.
Clement of Alexandria, I, 177-I91.
Clement of Rome (St.), I, 52-61.
Clement (Homily, so-called 11nd Epistle of), I, 79-80.
Clementines, I, 54.
Cleomenes, 1, 174.
Clichtove (Josse), II, 725, 735.
Climacus (St. John), 11, 284-287.
Cloud of Unknowing (The), 11, 706.
Cochlaeus, II, 732.
Coeffeteau, 11, 736.
Collectio hadriana, 11, 231.
Columba (St.), II, 208.
Colonna Ægidius, II, 639-641.
Comes (Marcellinus), 11, 228.
Comestor (Petrus), 11, 467.
Commodianus, I, 269-270.
Computus (De Pascha), I, 289.
Condren, II, 863.
Conrad Kollin, 11, 742.
Constitutions (Apostolic), I, 373.
Contenson, II, 863.
Controversialists, 1, 138-140.
Corinthians (correspondence of St. Paul with), i, 164.
Cornelius, I, 259.
Cosmas the Hymnodist, 11, 294.
Creed (Apostles'), 1, 37-42.
Cresconius, I, 627.
Crump (Henry), II, 674.
Cummian, 11, 277.
Cydones (Demetrius), II, 690.
Cyprian (St.), 1, 254-268
Cyprian (Proconsular Acts of), I, 290.
Cyprian the Gaul, I, 550.
Cyril of Alexandria (St.), n, 19-40.
Cyril of Jerusalem (St.) 1, 364-369.
Cyril of Scythopolis, II, 113.
Cyrillona, 1, 385.
Cyrus, n, 298.

D

Dada, I, 385.
Dadjesu, 1, 385.
Damascene (St. John), 11,326-340.
Damasus (St.), 1, 513.
Damian (St. Peter), II, 392-393.
Damian, 11, 66.
Damianites, 11, 66.
Dante, 11, 679-680.
David of Augsburg, 11, 700.
David of Dinant, II, 480.
David the Armenian, II, 118.
Decretal (five letters), I, 53.
Decretals of the Popes, I, 575.
Demetrius, 1, 279.
Demetrius Gydones, IT, 690.
Descartes, 11, 717.
Diadochus of Photike, 11, 107-in.
Dialogue between a Clerk and a Knight, π, 678.
Dictinius, I, 607.
Didache, I, 43-51.
Didascalia, I, 288.
Didymus the Blind, 1, 400-406.
Diego Alvarez, 11, 750.
Diego de Andrada, 11, 737.
Diodorus of Tarsus, I, 452-454.
Diogenetus (Epistle to), I, 113.
Dionysius of Alexandria (St.), 1, 275-278.
Dionysius of Corinth (St.), I, 153.
Dionysius of Rome (St.), I, 277.
Dionysius the Areopagite, 11, 86-IOI.
Dionysius the Carthusian, 11, 708.
Dionysius the Less, II, 229 231.
Dionysian Schools, II, 702-706.
Dioscurus, II, 63-64.
Dobneck (John), 11, 732.
Dominican School, II, 701-702, 793
Dominic (St.), 11, 701.

Dominici (John), II, 671, 723.
Dominic Bannez, 11, 748-750.
Dominic Soto, 11, 747.
Domitian of Ancyra, I, 219.
Donatists, 1, 296, 389-391.
Dormition of Mary, I, 162.
Dorotheus the Priest, I, 281.
Dorotheas (St.), II, 287.
Dracontius, 11, 215-217.
Duns Scotus (John), 11, 642-661.
Du Perron, 11, 736.
Durand (Barth.), II, 863.
Durandus of Aurillac, II, 671.
Durandus of St. Pourçain, II, 671.
Durandel, II, 671.

E

Ebionites (Gospel of), I, 159.
Eck (John), 11, 732.
Eckhart, II, 703.
Ecthesis (The), 11, 298.
Edessa (Chronicle oj), II, 114.
Edessa (School of), 11, 47-48.
Edessena (Acta), I, 164.
Edmund Campion (BL), 11, 735.
Egbert of York, (St.) II, 277.
Egyptians (Gospel according to), I, 160.
Elias of Crete, II, 287.
Elipandus, 11, 381.
Elishe the Doctor, π, 119.
Elpidius Rusticus, 11, 213.
Elpis, II, 213.
Encratites, 1, 107.
Endelechius, I, 550.
Ennodius (Magnus Felix, St.), Il, 156-158.
Ephraem (St.), 1, 378-384.
Ephraem of Antioch, 11, 72.
Epigonus, I, 174.
Epiphanius (St.), 1, 395-400.
Epitome, I, 372.
Epistles (apocryphal), 1, 164-165.
Erasmus, II, 716-724.
Eriugena (John Scotus), II, 384-385.
Escobar (A. de), II, 863.
Ethiofean apocrypha, 1, 55.
Eucherius of Lyons (St.), 11,166-167.
Euchites, I, 296.
Eudes (St. John), 11, 865.
Eudacius, I, 316.
Eugenius of Carthage, I, 192.
Eugenius of Toledo, (St.), u, 267.
Eugippius, n, 227.
Eulogius of Alexandria, 11, 295.
Eunomius, i, 315,
Euphemius,'11, 144.
Eusebius of Alexandria, 11, 106.
Eusebius of Cesarea, 1, 319-327
Eusebius of Dorylaeum, π, 53, 71.
Eusebius of Emesa, i, 316.
Eusebius of Nicomedia, I, 314.
Eusebius of Thessalonica, 11, 295.
Eusebius of Vercelli (St.), 1, 331.
Eustathius, π 72.
Eustathius of Antioch, I, 328.
Eustathius of Epiphania, II, 113.
Eustathius of Sebaste, 1, 318.
Eustratius, 11, 283.
Eutyches, 1, 52-54.
Eutychianism, 11, 53, 58.
Evagrius Ponticus, I, 506.
Evagrius Scholasticus, 11. 281.
Evagrius, 1, 494.
Evodius, I, 610.

facundus of Hermiane, 11, 153
Faustinas, 1, 333.
Faustus Byzantinus, II, 119.
Faustus of Milevis, I, 623.
Faustus of Riez, II, 171-174.
Favaroni, n, 729.
Felix of Urgel, 11, 381.
Felix III, (St.), π, 142.
Ficino (Marsilio), 11, 716.
Firmilian of Cesarea, 1, 282.
Fishacre (Richard), II, 488.
Fisher (St. John), II, 735.
Flavian of Antioch, 1, 494.
Florens Radewijns, 11, 706.
Florinus, 1, 104.
Fortunatus (St.) II, 214-217.
Franciscan School, 11, 668, 699'7°°
Francis of Assisi (St.), II, 699.
Francis of Meyronnes, II, 688.
Francis of Ossuna, II, 793.
Francis of Sales (St.), II, 84i-8°°.
Francis of Vittoria, II, 744.
Francis Hauzeur, 11, 863.
Francis Suarez, II, 778-784.
Francisco Toledo, 11, 766.
Frassen (CL), II, 863.
Fraticelli, 11, 692.
Frederick Staphylus, 11, 732.

Friends of God, II, 692.
Fronto of Cirta, I, 98.
Fulbert (St.), II, 392.
Fulgentius of Ruspe (St.), n, 191-, J99.
I ulgentius Feriandus, 11, 227.

G

Gabriel Biel, 11, 728
Gabriel Vasquez, 11, 767.
Gaianites, 11, 65.
Gandulf of Bologna, 11, 462.
Garcia de Cisneros, 11, 792.
Gaudentius, 1, 605.
Gelasius (St.), 11, 143-146.
Gelasius of Cesarea, I, 495.
Gelasius of Cyzicus, 11, 112.
Gemistos, 11, 715.
Gennadius of Constantinople, II, I0>
Gennadius of Marseilles, 11, 225-226.
George of Cyprus (St.), II, 330.
George of Laodicea, I, 316.
Gerard of Abbeville, II, 487.
Gerard of Bologna, 11, 487, 639, 674.
Gerard of Borgo, 11, 692.
Gerard Groot, 11, 706.
Gerard Segarelli, 11, 692.
Gerbert, 11, 391.
Gerhoch of Reichenberg, 11, 460.
Gerlac Peters, 11, 707.
Germanus of Constantinople (St.), II J-IQ
Gerson, 11, 687-689, 709-711.
Gertrude the Great (St.), II, 697.
Gilbert de la Porrée, II, 414, 460.
Gildas the Wise (St.) 11, 272.
Giles of Lessines, II, 668.
Giles of Rome, 11, 639-641.
Giles of Viterbo, II, 729.
Giordano Bruno, II, 715.
Gnostics, I, 100-104.
Gobarus (Stephen), 11, 65.
Godfrey of Fontaines, II, 642.
Gonet (J J, π, 863.
Gonzalez de Albeda, II, 759.
Gonzalez de Leon, 11, 759.
Goriun, 11, 118.
Gospels (apocryphal), I, 159-163.
Gottschalk, 11, 381.
Goudin (A.), 11, 863.
Gratian, 11, 468.
Gregory Bar Hebraeus, II, 71.
Gregory of Elvira, 1, 333.
Gregory of Nazianzus (St.), I, 415-423.
Gregory of Nyssa (St.), 1, 423" 430.
Gregory of Rimini, II, 673.
Gregory of Tours (St.), II, 268-271.
Gregory of Valencia, II, 767.
Gregory IX, 11, 484.
Gregory the Great (St.), II, 234-253.
Gregory the Syrian, I, 385.
Gregory Thaum. (St.), 1, 283-284.
Gregory the Illuminator, II, 115.
Grignon de Montfort (Bl.) II, 865.
Groot (Gerard), II, 706.
Gropper (John), 11, 732.
Gilbert of Tournai, II, 495.
Guido de Elemosina, 11, 487.
Guillaume du Vair, II, 725.
Gundisalvi, 11, 478.

H

Hadrian, I, 498.
Hauzeur (Francis), II, 863.
Haymo of Halberstadt, 11, 377.
Hebrews (Gospel of), I, 159.
Hegemonius, I, 569.
Hegesippus, 1, 140.
Helvidius, I, 577.
Henana, 11, 49.
HenoUcon, 11, 61-63.
Henry Crump, 11, 674.
Henry of Cremona, 11, 684.
Henry of Friemar, II, 673.
Henry of Gand, 11, 641, 671.
Henry Suso (BL), II, 705.
Henriquez, 11, 771.
Heracleanus, 11, 72.
Heracleon, 1, 104.
Hermas, 1, 83-96.
Hermias, 1, 135.
Hervé de la Queue, II, 671.
Hervé of Nedellec *(or* Natalis), II, 671.
Hesychius, 1, 279.
Hesychius of Jerusalem, 11, 102.
Hesychius of Miletus, II, 113.
Hieracas, 1, 279.
Hierotheus, 11, 88.

Hilarianus I (Rope), 1, 568.
Hilarius, (St.), II, 142.
Hilary *of* Arles (St.), 11, 165-166.
Hilary of Poitiers (St.), 1, 355 364.
Hilary of Rome, I, 333.
Hiklebcrt of Lavardin, 11, 463.
Hildegarde (St.), II, 695.
Hilton (Walter), II, 706.
Hincmar, 11, 383.
Hippolytus (St.), I, 220-229.
Hippolytus (38 canons of), I, 372.
Hippolytum (Constitutiones per), i

Hochstraten, 11, 732.
Holcot (Robert), 11, 672.
Homoeans, 1, 316.
Homoiousians, 1, 316-319.
Honoratus (St.), il, 161.
Honorius I, 11, 298.
Honorius III, 11, 484.
Honorius of Autun, 11, 368.
Hormisdas (St.), 11, 147-150.
Hormisdas (Formula of), 11, 63,149.
Hosius (Stanislas), 11, 732.
Hugolinus of Orvieto, 11, 675.
Hugh (St.), n, 694.
Hugh de Billon, 11, 637.
Hugh of Mortagne, II, 462.
Hugh of St. Cher, II, 488.
Hugh of Saint Victor, 11,442-450.
Hugh Ripelin of Strasburg, n, 638.
Humbert (Cardinal), II, 387.
Humbert of Brouilly *{or* Prully), 11, 639.

Ibas, II, 47.
Ibn Badja, 11, 477.
Ibn Roschd, ll, 477.
Ibn Sina, 11, 477.
Ibn Tofaïl, 11, 477.
Idaeus, II, 257.
Ignatius of Antioch, (St.), 1,61-73.
Ignatius of Loyola (St.) 11, 795-800.
Ignatius of Nicea, II, 284.
Ildephonsus, (St.), II, 267.
Imitation ofJesus Christ, 11, 7°7-
Innocent I (St.), I, 516.
Innocent 111, 11, 484.
Instantius, I, 607.
Irenæus (St.), 1, 141-153.
Irenæus (Count), il, 16, 1Γ4.
Isaac of Amid, I, 385.
Isaac of Antioch, I, 385.
Isaac Israeli, II, 478.
Isidore of Seville (St.), n3 258-266.
Isidorus, I, 103.
Isidorus of Pelusium, I, 498.
Ithacius, I, 607.
Itinerarium burdi'galense, 1 -5-

Jacob Bar Salibi, 11, 71.
Jacob of Telia, II, 71.
Jacopo de Voragine, II, 638.
James of Edessa, 11, 71.
James of Sarugh, II, 70.
James of Viterbo, II, 639, 672, 68}.
James (Protoewangelium off j, 160.
Jansenists, II, 864.
Javelli, 11, 743.
John *of* Hoogstraten, 11, 732.
John de la Rochelle, 11, 494.
John Lemoine, II, 684.
Jerome (St.). I, 569'593-
Jerome Savonarola, II, 723-739.
Joachim *of* Flora, II, 460, 692, 696.
Joachimites, II, 692.
Joannes Quidort, 11, 636.
Jobius, n, 72.
John (Acts of), I, 163.
John Azor, II, 765.
John Bacon, 11, 674.
Jean-Baptiste de la Salle (St.), 11 865.
Jean Trithème, 11, 368.
John Bar-Cursus, 11, 70.
John Brammart, II, 674.
John Buridan, 11, 667.
John Capistrano (St.) 11, 723-
John Capreolus 11, 739.
John Chrysostom (St.), 1, 460-493-
John Climacus (St.), 11 284-287.
John Damascene (St.), 11, 326-340.
John of Antioch, 11, 282.
John of Asia (or of Ephesus), II, 70.
John of Avila (Bl.), 11, 792.
John of Bale, II, 673.
John of Bassolis, II, 669.
John of Biclaro, 11, 257.

John of Carpathus, II, 288.
John of Castel, li, 695.
John of Freiburg, II, 638.
John of Jandun, II, 675.
John of Jerusalem, I, 495·
John of the Cross (St.), II, 8-4" 840.
ohn of Mirecourt, II, 667, 674·
ohn of Monzon, 11, 670.
John of Niku, 11, 282.
John of Pouilly, II, 675.
John of Ragusa, 11, 689.
John of Raithu, II, 286, 287.
John of Reading, II, 669.
John of Erfurt, II, 669.
John of Ripa, 11, 669.
John of St. Giles, 11, 488.
John of St. Thomas, 11, 863.
John of Salisbury, II, 4'4, 4^4-
John of Scythopolis, II, 72·
John of Thessalonica, 11, 3*5-
John of Eubæa, 11, 316.
John Dobneck, 11, 732·
John Dominici, π, 671, 723·
John Duns Scotus, II, 642-061.
John Eck, 11, 732·
John Fisher (St.), II, 735·
John Gropper, II, 732.
John Huss, li, 667.
John II, Pope, π, 15 !·
John 111, The Scholastic, II, 278-280.
John IV, The Faster, 11, 280-281.
John Lansperge, II, 7°8·
John the Ahnsgiver, (St.), 11, 284.
John the Grammarian, II, 72·
John the Prophet (St.), II, 287.
John Mayor, 11, 728.
John Malalas *{or* the Rhetor), II, 278-282.
John Mandakuni, II, 118-
John Mascentius, II, 73·
John Moschus, 11, 283.
John Olivi, ii, 692.
John Peckham, 11, 494·
John Philoponus, H, 65.
John Rufus, π, 71, II2·
John Ruysbroek, 11, 7°5-
John Scotus Eriugena, II, 3b4·
John Tauler, II, 7°4-
John \zeccos, II, 689.
lohn Vital, II, 670.
Jona et Ninive (De), 1, 55°·
Jordanis (A.), 11, 228.
Joseph of Thessalonica, 11, 294.
Joseph the Carpenter (History oj), I, 162.
Joseph the Hymnographer, II, 294.
Josse Clichtove, 11, 725, 735.
Josuc the Stylite, 11, 114.
Journeys to Palestine, 11, 228.
Jovinian, I, 577.
Judas Iscariot (Gospel of), I, 160.
Judæo-Christians, I, 99-100.
Julian (St.), II, 267.
Julian of Eclanuni, I, 394.
Julian of Halicarnassus, II, 64.
Julian of Kos, 11, 130.
Julianists, 11, 65.
Julianus Pomarus, II, 180-184.
Julius Africanus, I, 279.
Junilius, π, 65.
Justus Lipsius, II, 717.
Justus of Urgél, II, 257.
Justin (St.), I, 114-129.
Justin (Acts of), I, 290.
Justinian, 11, 257.
Justinian, 1,11, 78-86.
Juvencus, I, 554.

K

Kilwardby (Richard) π, 634.
Kollin Conrad, II, 742·

L

Lacroix (Cl.), 11, 863.
Lactentius, 1, 271-274.
Lanfranc (Bl.), 11, 393.
Langton (Stephen), 11, 483.
Lansperge (John), II, 708.
Laodiceans (Epistle to), I, 164.
Latinizers (Latinophrones), 11. 690.
Latomus, I, 735.
Latronianus, 1, 607.
Laude Martyrii (De), I, 289.
Laudes Domini, I, 550.
Laymann, 11, 863.
Lazarus of Pharp, II, 119.
Leander (St.), 11, 255-257.
Lefèvre d'Etaples, II, 725
Lemoine (John), II, 684.
Leonardo da Vinci, 11, 715.
Leontius Byzantinus, 11, 73-78·
Leontius of Neapolis, II, 284. 315.
Leontius of St. Sabas, II, 284.

Leo the Great (St.), Il, 122-141.
Leporius, 1, 634.
Lessius (Leonard), II, 767.
Letters to the Virgins (Two), I, 81-82.
Liberatus of Carthage, 11, 154-228.
Liberius, 1, 333-335.
Liber Pontificalis, II, 226.
Lindanus, 11, 736.
Lives of Fathers oj the Desert, I, 500.
Lombard (Peter), 11, 457-460.
Louis Bertrand (St.), 11, 789.
Louis of Blois, II, 793.
Louis of Granada, II, 793.
Louis du Pont, 11, 801.
Lucian of Samosata, (St.), I, 281.
Lucian of Samosata, 1, 98.
Lucidus, ii, 172.
Lucifer of Cagliari, I, 332.
Ludolph of Saxony (the Carthusian), li, 708.
Lugo, π, 863.
Luis de Leon, II, 794.
Luis Molina, 11, 766.
Lully (Bl. Raymond), II, 496, 700.
Luther, ii, 718-722.
Lichetto (Francis), 11, 730.
Lyons and Vienne (Letters oj the Churches of), 1, 290.

M

Macarius of Alexandria (St.), I, 503.
Macarius the Great (St.), 1, 505.
Macarius Magnes, I, 595.
Macedo (Fr.), 11, 863.
Macedonians, 1, 285.
Macedonius (Bishop), I, 318.
Macedonius (Patriarch), 11, 72.
Maimonides, II, 478.
Maître Martin, II, 462.
Malabranca, 11, 673.
Malchion, 1, 281.
Mamertus (Claudianus), 11, 179-180.
Mandakuni (John), H, 118.
Manichaeans, I, 170 and 296.
Mar Aba, I, 385.
Mar Aba, II, 49.
Marathonians, 1, 285.
Marathonius, 1, 318.
Marcellus *of* Ancyra, I, 330.
Marcellinus Conies, 11, 228.
Marcion, 1, 104.
Mark the Hermit, I, 5°^.
Marius of Lausanne, II, 228.
Marius Mercator, 11, *178-179-*
Marius Victor, I, 550.
Marius Victorious, I, 331.
Marouta, 1, 385.
Marsile of Inghem, II, 667.
Marsilio Ficino, II, 716.
Marsilius of Padua, 11, 675, 681.
Martin of Braga (St.), II, 253-255.
Marlin of Fugeriis, II, 462.
Martin (Raymond), II, 638.
Martyrology (so-called, of St. Jerome), I, 568.
Masson (Latomus), 11, 735-
Massoulie 11, 859, 863.
Mathias (Gosfel, Traditions of), 1, 160.
Matthew (Gospel oj Pseudo-), 1. 161.
Matthew (Martyrium of St.), 1, 164.
Matteo of Aquasparta, 11, 494·
Maurice of Spain, II, 479.
Mauritius de Portu, 11, 730.
Maurus (Rabanus), 11, 376, 391.
Maxentius (John), II, 73.
Maximus of Turin (St.), II, 155·
Maximus the Confessor (St.), it , 306-313.
Mayeul (St.), 11, 694.
Mayor (John), 11, 728.
Mechtilde of Hackeborn (St.), 11, 697.
Mechtilde of Magdebourg (St.) Il, 697.
Meditationes Vita Christi, u, 700.
Melanchton, 11, 722.
Melchior Cano, II, 745-747
Melelius of Antioch, 1, 329.
Melilo of Sardes, I, 135.
Melitonis (Oratio), i, 135.
Menander, 1, 103.
Mesrob or Mashtots, 11, 116.
Methodius (St.), 11, 284, 324.
Methodius of Olympus, 1, 285-286.
Michael Caerularius, II, 386.
Michael of Cesena, 11, 692.
Michael of Corbeil, 11, 464.
Millenarianists, I, 106.
Miltiades, 1, 134.
Minucius Felix, I, 136-138.

Modalists, I. 173 and 295.
Modestus *of* Jerusalem, II, 315.
Molina, n, 766.
Mongus (Peter), II, 64.
Monophysites, II, 52-71.
Monothelites, II, 297-303.
Montanus, I, 105.
More (St. Thomas), 11, 725, 735.
Moschus (John), 11, 282.
Motazilites, 11, 477.
Motacallimin, 11, 477.
Moses of Chorene, 11, 120.
Muratori (Canon of), 1, 155-156.

N

Narses, 11, 48.
Nativity ofMary (Gospel of), 1,161.
Nemesius, 1, 496.
Neo-Platonists, 1, 168-170; h, 637-638.
Nephalius, 11, 72.
Nepos, I, 279.
Nerses the Great,, π, 115.
Nestorians, 1, 296.
Nestorius, 11, 15-19.
Niccphonis the Confessor (St.), Π, 323.
Nicetas of Rcmesiana, 1, 603-604.
Nicetas Pectoratus, 11, 387.
*Nicodemus (Gospel of*j, 1, 162.
Nicolai, 11, 759.
Nicholas of Autrccourl, 11, 675·
Nicholas of Cusa, II, 724, 729.
Nicholas of Lisieux, 11, 487.
Nicholas of Amiens, 11, 466.
Nicholas 1, 11, 380.
Nilus of Sinai, 1, 507.
Niobites, II, 59.
Niphus (Aug.), II, 716.
Nisibis (School of), 11, 48-49.
Noel (Alexandre), II.
Noetus, I, 174.
Nomocanons, 11, 278-280.
Noris, li, 762.
Novatian, 1, 250-254.
Novatians and Novatianists, T, 252.
Novatianum (Ad),I, 254, 288.

O

Ockham, II, 663-667.
Octatcuch of Clement, I, 374.
Odes of Solomon, I, 157.
Odilo (St.), li, 694.
Odo (St.), II, 694.
Odo of Cambrai, 11, 391.
Olier, II, 865.
Olivi (Peter of John), III, 495-496.
Olympiodorus, 11, 104.
Olympius, I, 607.
Ophites, I, 104.
Optatus of M ilevis (St.), 1, 608-610
Optatianus Porphyrins, 1, 548.
Oracles (Sibylline), I, 165.
Oratorian (School), 11, 865.
Orientius, I, 550.
Origen, 1, 191-220.
Origenists, 1, 217-220, 296.
Orlando Bandinelli, 11, 468.
Orosius (Paulus), I, 560-562, 607.
Osius of Cordova, 1, 331.
Otho, π, 461.

P

Pachomius (St.), I, 504.
Pacianus (St.), 1, 606.
Palladius, 1. 501.
Pamphilius (St.), I, 280.
Pamphilius of Jerusalem, II, 73.
Pantaenus, 1, 178.
Papias, I, 76-77.
Paracelsus, II, 715.
Paradise ofHeraclides, I, 500.
Parmenianus, 1, 390.
Pascha Computus (De), I, 289.
Paschasius Radbertus, 11, 382.
Pastor, I, 607.
Patrizzi, II, 715.
Paul (Acts of), I, 163.
Paul (Apocalypse of), 1, 165.
Paul (Correspondence of), I, 164.
Paul (Preaching of), 1, 163.
Paul of the Cross (St.), 11, 865.
Paul of Perugia, II, 674.
Paul of Samosata, 1, 175-176.
Paul of Telia, 11. 71.
Paulinus of Aquilaea, 11, 381.
Paulinus of Beziers, 1, 552.
Paulinus of Noia, j, 551-554.
Paulinus of Pella, 1, 552.
Paulinus of Perigueux, 1, 552.
Paulonas, 1, 385.
Paulus Orosius, I, 560-562, 607.
Peckham (John), II, 494.

Pectoratus (Nicetas), n, 387.
Pectorius, 1, 154.
Pelagians, I, 296 and 389.
Pelagius, I, 392.
Pelagius 1, 11, 152.
Pelagius Alvarius, II, 684.
Penitential Books, II, 276-278.
Peregrinatio ad loca sancta, I, 567.
Perpetua et Felicitas (Passion of Saints), I, 290.
Persians (School of), 11, 47.
l'étau, π, 737.
Peter (Acts of), 1, 165.
Peter (Gospel of), 1, 162.
Peter (Preaching of), 1, 163.
Peter and Paul (Acts of the Apostles), I, 163.
Peter by Clement (Apocalypse of), I, 165.
Peter Abelard, 11, 416-421..
Peter Auriol, II, 669.
Peter Canisius (St.), 11, 733.
Peter Chrysologus (St.), 11, 154-155.
Peter of Alcantara (St.), II, 794.
Peter of Alexandria, I, 279.
Peter Damian (St.), II, 392.
Peter of Auvergne, II, 641.
Peter of Aquila, II, 669.
Peter of Blois, II, 466.
Peter of Candía, 11, 669.
Peter of Capua, 11, 483.
Pedro da Fonseca, 11, 766.
Peter of John Olivi, 11. 495.
Peter Paludanus, 671.
Peter of Poitiers, II, 462.
Peter de Soto *or* Sotomayor, 11, 747.
Peter of Tarentaise, 11, 488.
Peter of Vaux or Valdo, 11, 692.
Peter Fullo, II, 66.
Peter the Venerable, II, 695.
Peter Lombard, 11, 457-460.
Peter Mongus, 11, 64.
Petrus Tartaretus, 11, 73°·
Peters (Gerlac), I, 7°7-
Petilianus, I, 391.
Petrus Cantor, 11, 467.
Petrus Comestor, 11, 467.
Pettau (St. Victorinus of), I, 274.
Phantasiasts, 11, 59.
Philastrius, I, 604.
Phileas, 1, 279.
Philip (Acts of), I, 164.
Philip (Gospel of), 1, 160.
Philip of Greve, 11, 483.
Philip Schwarzerd, 11, 722.
Philoponus (John), 11, 65.
Philo of Carpasia, I, 495.
Philostorgius, I, 318.
Philoxenus of Mabbogh. 11. 70.
Photinians, I, 295.
Photius, II, 378-380.
Pico della Mirandola (Giovanni), II, 716.
Pierius, 1, 274.
Pierre Charron, II, 725, 736.
Pierre, d'Ailly, 11, 686.
Pighius (Albertus), II, 735.
Pisides (G.), II, 292.
Pisiis Sophia, I, 104.
Plethon, II, 715.
Plotinus, I, 169.
Pneumatomachi, I, 295.
Pole (Reginald), 11, 735.
Polycarp (St.), I, 73-75.
Polycarp (Martyrdom of), I, 290.
Polycarp the Syrian, II, 70.
Polychronius of Apamea, 1, 496.
Polycrates, I, 153.
Pomarus (Julianus), II, 180-184.
Pomponazzi, 11, 716.
Pontianus, 1, 250.
Porphyry, I, 169.
Pontificalis Libet, 11. 226.
Possessor, li, 194.
Possiditis (St.), I, 611.
Praxeas, 1, 174.
Predestinationists, II, 381.
Prevostin (William), 11, 467.
Primasius of Hadrumetum, 11. 153·
Priscillian, 1, 606-608.
Priscillianists, I, 296 and 607.
Proba, I, 548.
Proclus, II, 94.
Procopius of Gaza, 11, 104.
Prosper of Aquitania (St.), 11, 184-190.
Prudentius, 1, 554-558.
Ptolemy the Gnostic, 1, 104.
Ptolemy of Lucca, 11, 637, 684.

Quadratus, 1, 1 io.
Quastio iti utramque pattern, 678.
Quarto-decimans, 1, 140.

Quicumque vult, I, 349.
Quidort (John), II, 637.

R

Rabanus Maurus, 11, 376.
Rabulas, I, 385.
Radbertus (Paschasius), 11, 382.
Radwijns (Florens), II, 706.
Ratramnus, II, 382.
Raymond of Capua, π, 702.
Raymond of Pennafort (St.), π 488.
Raymond Lulle (Bl.), 11, 496, 700.
Raymond Martin, II, 638.
Rebaptismale, (De), I, 288.
Recognitiones, 1, 54.
Reginald Pole, 11, 735.
Reticius of Autun (St.), 1, 274.
Reuchlin, II, 716.
Rex Pacificus, II, 678.
Rhodo, I, 146.
Richard Clapwell, 11, 636.
Richard of St. Victor, 11, 450-455.
Richard Fishacre, II, 488.
Richard Middleton *{or* de Mediavilla), II, 495.
Richard Rolle, II, 706.
Ripalda (M. de), 11, 863.
Robert Bacon, 11, 488.
Robert Bellarmine (St.), n, 768-770.
Robert of Courçon, li, 483.
Robert Kilwardby, II, 488.
Robert ol Melun, 11, 463.
Robert Grosse-Tête, I, 494.
Robert Holcol, II, 672.
Robert Sorbon, 11, 483.
Rodriguez, il, 801.
Roger Bacon, II, 496.
Roger Marston, II, 497.
Roland Bandinelli, 11, 468.
Roland of Cremona, II, 488.
Rolle (Richard), 11, 706.
Romanos (St.), 11, 289-292.
Roscelin, 11, 391.
Ruard Tapper, 11, 736.
Rufinus, I, 562-567.
Rulus (John), II, 112.
Rupert of Deutz, II, 695.
Rusticus Elpidius, 11, 213.
Ruysbroek (Bl. John), II, 705.
Ruys de Montoyo, II, 863.

S

Saadia, II, 478.
Sabellians, I, 295.
Sabellius, I, 174.
Sabinus, I, 318.
Saccas, (Ammonius), I, 169.
Sacramentary (Gelasian), II, 146.
Sacramentar)' (Gregorian), II, 242.
Sacramentary (Leonine), II, 135.
Sahak III the Great, II, 116.
Salmanticenses, II, 863.
Salvianus, II, 159-161.
Sanchez, II, 771.
Saturninus or Satornil, I, 103.
Savonarola (Jerome), II, 723, 739.
Sayings, I, 500.
Schenoudi, I, 505.
Schwarzerd (Philip), II, 722.
Sci!Hum (Acts of the Martyrs ol), I, 290.
Scotus (John Duns), 11, 642-661.
Scotus (John Eriugena), II, 384.
Scupoli, π, 801.
Scythian monks, II, 73.
Secundinus, I, 624.
Sedulius, I, 548.
Segarelli (Gerard), II, 692.
Seneca (Correspondence of St. Paul and), I, 164.
Sententiae Divinitatis, π, 460.
Serapion of Antioch, I, 153.
Serapion of Thmuis, I, 370.
Sergius, II, 292, 297.
Sergius the Grammarian, II, 65.
Seripando, II, 730.
Sethinas, 1, 104.
Severian of Gabala, I, 494.
Severus of Antioch, 11, 66-69.
Severus of Malaga, II, 258.
Severus Sanctus, I, 550.
Sibert of Beck, 11, 674.
Sibylline Oracles, 1, 165.
Sidonius Apollinaris (St.),11,210-213.
Sigebert de Gembloux, 11, 368.
Siger of Brabant, 11, 479.
Silverius (St.), Il, 151.
Silvia (Pseudo-), I, 567.
Simeon, 11, 284.
Simeon Stylites the Younger, (St.), II, 288.
Simon Magus, I, 103.

binion of Tournai, 11, 483.
Simplicianus (St.), 1, 605.
Simplicius (St.), II, 142.
Siricius, (St.), I, 516.
Socrates, 11, 111.
Sodoma (De), I, 550.
Soiomoti (Odes of), 1, 157.
Sophronius ol Jerusalem, 11,303-306.
Sorbon (Robert), II, 483.
Soto and Sotomayor, 11, 747.
Sozomen, 11, 112.
Spectaculis (De), I, 288.
Spirituals, II, 692.
Stanislas Hosias, II, 732.
Staphylus (Frederick), 11, 732.
Stapleton (Th), 11, 735.
Stephen 1 (St.), 1, 260.
Stephen (Apocalypse of), 1, 165.
Stephen Bar-Sudaili, 11, 70.
Stephen of Bourret, II, 635.
Stephen of Tournai, II, 464.
Stephen Gobarus, II, 65.
Stephen Langton, II, 483.
Stephen of Melos, II, 284.
Stephen Tempier, II, 470, 635.
Stercorianism, II, 382.
Suarez (Francis), 11, 778-788.
Sulpicius Severus, I, 558-560.
Summa Sententiarum, n, 461.
Summists, II, 460-469.
Surius (L.), II, 708.
Suso (Bl. Henry), II, 705.
Sutton (Thomas), II, 642.
Syagrius, I, 607.
Sylvester of Ferrara, 742.
Sylvester II, II, 391.
Symmachus, Pope, II, 146.
Sympronianus, 606.
Synesius of Cyrene, I, 496.
Synodicon adversus tragcediam Irencei, 11, 114.
Synodicon Orientale, II, 51.
Synousiasles, I, 452.
Syrian Authors, II, 46-51.

T

Tajón (St.), II, 267.
Tanner (A.), II, 863.
Tapper (Ruard), II, 730.
Tarasius (St.), II, 323.
Tartaretus, II, 73°.
Tatian, I, 130-131, 375.
Taulcr (John), 11, 704.
Te Deum, I, 535, 604.
Telesius, 11, 715.
Tell-Mahre (Chronicle of), 11, 114
Tempier (Stephen), II, 479, 635.
Terre (Guy), 11, 674.
Tertullian, 1, 229-249, 375.
Tetradites, 11, 66.
Testament of Our I.ord, I, 372.
Thaddcus (Acts ol), I, 164.
Thaddeus (Gospel of), I, 160.
Thalassius, II, 288.
Themistius, II, 66.
Theodore Abukara, II, 325.
Theodore Askidas, I, 219.
Theodore of Ancyra, II, 105.
Theodore of Canterbury, II, 277.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 1, 455-460.
Theodore of Raithu, H, 296.
Theodore, monk of the Thebaid, 1. 504
Theodore of Studium (St.), 11, 294, 340-349.
Theodoret of Cyrus, 11, 40-46.
Theodorus Lector, II, 112.
Theodotus the Banker, I, 175.
Theodotus the Elder, I, 175.
Theodotus the Gnostic, I, 104.
Theodulus, II, 103.
Theognostus, I, 278.
'I heopaschites, II, 58.
Theophanes Graptos, II, 294.
Theophilus of Alexandria, I, 496.
Theophilus of Antioch (S.), I, 133 134.
Theophilus (Monastic History of Theodoret of Cyrus), I, 500.
Teresa (St.), 11/802-824.
Thierry of Chartres, 11, 414.
Thierry of Freiburg, II, 637.
Thomas (Acts of), I, 164.
Thomas (Apocalypse of), I, 165.
Thomas (Gospel of), I, 160.
Thomas a Kempis, II, 707.
Thomas Bradwardine, II, 667.
Thomas Aquinas (St.J, II, 526-638.
Thomas de Bailly, II, 676.
Thomas of Jesus, II, 794.
Thomas of Jorz, II, 671.
Thomas of Lemos, 11, 750.
Thomas of Strasburg, 11, 673.

Thomas of Torquemada, II, 739.
Thomas of Villeneuve (St.), II, 794·
Thomas of Heraclea, II, 71.
Thomas of York, II, 495;
Thomas the Israelite (Gospel of), b 160.
Thomas More (St.), 725» 735·
Thomassin, II, 737, 865.
Thomas Sutton, II, 671.
Timotheus of Constantinople, Π, 295.
Timothy Aelurus, II, 64.
Timothy of Jerusalem, II, 106.
Tiphanius, II, 863.
Titus of Bostra, I, 370.
Toledo (Francis), II, 766.
Tome to Flavian, 11, 54·
Traditionalist School, I, 300.
Traditions of Mathias, I, 160.
Transitus Sancite Marite, i, 162.
Trigos (Peter), II, 730.
Triumphus (Augustinus), II, 672.
Tritheists, π, 65.
Trithème (John), II, 368.
Tronson, II, 865.
Tropicists, I, 285.
Trypho I, 279.
Turribius, I, 607.
Tychonius, 1, 391.
Type (The), II. 298.

U

Ubertino of Casale. Il, 692.
Ulric of Strasburg, li, 6j8.
Unam Sanctam (Glose on the Bull) Π, 679.

V

Valentine, I, 104.
Van der Linden, II, 735.
Véceos, (John), II, 689.
\zerecundus of Junca, II, 153, 216.
Victor (St.), I, 153.
Victor (Augustinian School of St. II, 697-699.
Victor of Antioch, II, 104.
Victor of Cartenna, II, 192
Victor of'Funnum, II, 228.
Victor de Vita, II, 228.
Victorious of Pettau (St.), B 274.
Victorious, Marius, I, 331.
Vigilantius, 1, 577.
Vigilius (Pope), ii, 151.
Vigilius of Thapsus, il, 192.
Vincent of Beauvais, II, 638.
Vincent of Lerins (St.), I, 18; ii, 167-171.
Vincent of Paul (St.), H, 865.
Vincent Ferrier (St.), II, 702.
Virgins (Two letters to the), I, St-82.
Vital (John), II, 670.
Vittoria, II, 734.
Voconius, ii, 192,

W

Waldensians, II, 692.
Walter Burleigh, II, 669.
Walter of Catton, II, 669.
Walter Hilton, II, 706.
Walter of Mortagne, II, 461.
Walter of St. \Victor, II, 463·
Windesheim (School of), II, 7°6-
William of Auvergne, II, 481-483.
William of Auxerre, II, 4^3·
William of Champeaux, II, 416.
William of Conches, II, 4M-
William of Hoz.un, II, 637·
William of Mara, II, 494·
William of Melilo, II, 493·
William of Moerbeke, II, 637·
William of St. Amour, Π, 4«7·
William of St. Thierry, Π, 4θ4·
William of Ware, II, 495- ζ/.
William of Ockham, II, 663-°
William Prévostin, II, 4^7·
Wodehan (Adam), II, 669.
Wyclif, II, 667.

Yves de Chartres, II, 467.

Zacharias Rhetor, II, 112
Zenob of Glak, II, 120.
Zenobius, 1, 385.
Zeno (St.), I, 332.
Zimara (A.) , II, 716.
Zosimas (St.), II, 287.
Zoșimuș (St.), I. 393' 5'9·

DOCTRINAL INDEX[1]

I. — GENERAL DATA FOR THE INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY.

A) PRELIMINARY DATA.

1. Doctrine. — Definition : it comprises dogma and moral, I, 4-5. Systematisation since the Middle Ages, II, 357-360. Methods in general, II, 354-356› 470-473, 364-366. See *Schools,* nos. 8-10, 12 and 130. Doctors of the Church, I, 3; II, 861 (list). See *Fathers,* n. 34. Masters in theology, II, 471-473. Doctrine and humanism, II, 353, 369, 414, 465, 712-715, 724-725, 739, 744, 799, 841, 860, See *Humanism,* n. 18.

2.Dogma. — Definition, I, 4. History of Dogma, I, 5, 17-19. Development of Dogma, I, 18; II, 167-171 (St. Vincent *of* Lerins; Newman). Deposit of faith preserved by Fathers, II, 351, 861, 867. *Definitions of the Councils,* I, 301 (Nicea), 418, 419 and 425 (1st Constantinople); II, 28-31 (Ephesus), 55-56 and 128-129 (Chalcedon), 83-84 (linci Constantinople), 302 (lllrd Constantinople), 320 (llnd Nicea), 725-726 (Trent). See *Councils,* n. 33. *Pontifical definitions :* I, 393 and 632 (Zosimus); II, 204 (Approbation of the Council of Orange by Boniface II), 677 (Boniface \ZI 11). See *Afioslolic See,* n. 95.

3. Moral. Definition I, 20. Moral, mystical and ascetic theology, I, 19: II, 618. Moral synthesis, See *Moral Theology,* n. 103 sq. Systems, II, 748 and 771 (probabilism); 770-771 (casuists). Moral theology, moralisti! and mysticism, I, 30; II, 361, 365, 845, 866. See *Doctrinal tendencies,* n. 7. Moralisti! and humanism, II, 718, 725, 790-791 (Erasmus etc.), 855, 860 (St. Francis of Sales).

4. Theology. Definition, I, 670-672 (St. Augustine); II, 574 (St. Thomas). Division : Dogmatic and Moral Theology, I, 20; II, 598 (subdivisions); II, 355 (positive, affective, speculative); 389 (Theology (Theology and Canon-Law). Contemplative Theology, I, 669 (St. Augustine); II, 508 (St. Bonaventure). Mystical theology or contemplation, II, 95-96 (Dionysius the Areopagite). Mystical theology or the theology of mystical graces, I, 20; 11, 355. See *Mystical Theology,* n. 78. Affirmative and negative theology, I, 182-184, 189 (Clement of Alex.); II, 99 (Dionysius the Areopagite). Mystical gifts and theology, I, 185 (Clement of Alex.), 687 (St. Augustine); II, 576 (Augustinians). Chief methods, I, 686-688 (St. Augustine); II, 354 (medieval), 458 (Peter Lombard), 470-473 (xillth cent.), 481 (William of Auvergne), 506-508 (St. Bonaventure), 555, 573'5/6 (St. Thomas), 647-651 (Duns Scotus), 784 (Suarez). See *Schools of Theology,* n. 8-9.

[1] The *numbers* refer to the pages of the two volumes. Ad *alphabetical index* of subjects treated will be found at the end of this index.

5. History of Theology. *Origins,* I, 108-110 (Apologists), 163-169, 165, 171 sq., 201 sq., (Controversialists). Popular opposition to theology, i/o. See 387-389 (ivth century developments). *Systematisation,* 11, 352, and 861. Theology and Canon Law, 389 (mixed collections). Various monographs, 398-403 (St. Anselm). Thomist influence, II, 570-576. Decadence, 661 sq. (xiv cent.), 727 (Renaissance revival).

6. Doctrinal treatises. *Early elementary theological treatises.* i, 144-14Ó (St. Irenaeus); 197-200, 210-211 (Origen); 272 (Lactantius); 367 (Catecheses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem) : 426 (St. Gregory of Nyssa); 650-651 (St. Augustine); II, 260-261 (St. Isidore), 330 (St.John Damascene), 377 (ixth cent, compilation), 389 (Canonical compilations). *First Summas,* II, 457-460 (Peter Lombard) 460-467 (various xiith cent, authors), 481-484 (xlllth cent.), 485-496 (Mendicants). Great commentaries of the Sentences, 493 (Alex, of Hales), 502 (St. Bonaventure), 532, 543, (St. Thomas), 645 (Scotus). St. Thomas's *Summa theologica:* 554-569; great commentaries : see *Thomism,* n. 8. Catechisms or elementary treatises. II, 726 (Roman catechism), 734 (St. Canisius).

7. Doctrinal Tendencies. Moralism and Mysticism : Definitions, I, 30; 11, 361, 365, 844, 867. Examples of Mysticism, 1, 185 sq., (Alexandrians), 543, (St. Ambrose) 662-664, 713-716 (St. Augustine) II, 358 (Medieval Augustinians), 404-408 (St. Anselm), 442 (Victorines), 506-509 (St. Bonaventure), etc. Examples of Moralism, 1, 267 (St. Cyprian), 486 sq., (St. John Chrysostom), 539 sq., (St. Ambrose), II, 243 (St. Greg, the Great), 724 (Humanists), 844 and 860 (St. Francis of Sales), — Other special tendencies : see *Schools,* nos 8, 9, 10, 12, 130.

8. Schools of Theology.—

A) Early Schools : School of Alexandria, 1, 297 sq., 184 sq., 201 sq. ; π, 10-14. School of Antioch, I, 298-300, 455-460, 486 sq. ; π, 10-14. Traditionalist School, I, 300. School of Edessa, I, 379, II, 47; School of Nisibis, II, 48 sq.. School of Gaza, II, 103-104. See *Augiistinism,* n. 9.

S) New Schools: For the medieval Augustinian schools, see *Augustinism. — a) Dominicans :* II, 485 (origin), 487 (Dominican Augustinians), 488-490 (Albert the Great). Thomism·' characteristics, II, 57o-576; doctrinal synthesis (philosophy), II, 576-585, (theology), 585-633 Growth of Thomism, II, 633-635 (early opposition), 635-638 (Dominican Thomists), 638-641 (Thomists outside the Order) ; 670-672 (xivth cent.) and (Renaissance) 738-740. Great commentators, 740-742 (Cajetan), 742 (Sylv. of Ferrara etc.), 744 sq. (Vittoria etc.), 748 sq. (Bannez), (more recent authors). See *Congruism,* n. 73. Spiritual Doctrine, see *Schools of Spirituality,* n. 130. — *b} Franciscans :* II, 486 (Origin), 491-494 (Parisian Masters), 494 (Oxford Masters), 494 sq. (Independents), 506-526 (St. Bonaventure). Scotism : general outline, 646-660. Growth : 668-670 (xivth cent.), 730 (xvth and XVIth cent.) : see *Schools of Spirituality,* n. 130. — r) *Jesuits:* II, 763-765 (general outline), 766-768 (first theologians) 768-770 (Bellarmine), 733-735 (Canisius). Suarezism : 781-790, 771-777 (Molinism), 770 (moral theology)· See *Schools of Spirituality,* n. 130. — //) *Other Schools:* Benedictines, II, 393 (Bl. Lanfranc, 404-412 (St. Anselm). See *Augustinism,* n. 9, and *Scholasticism,* n. n. Carmelites 487 and

674. Cistercians, 674. *Seculars* with various tendencies, II, 414-416 (xiith cent.), 467-469 (Summists xiith cent.), 481-484 (xlllth cent.), 640-641 (end xlllth cent., 675 (xivth cent.), 687-589 (D'Ailly, Gerson;. 728 (Renaissance, 731-738 (Controversialists against Protestantism) See also *Schools of Spirituality,* n. 130.

9. Augustinism. —

A) General Augustinism. Definition: a spirit rather than a system, I, 714; II, 356. Essential characteristics, I, 670-673, 714-715; II, 8, 176, 356-358, 473-475· Chief medieval representatives: II, 404-407, (St. Anselm), 430-432 (St. Bernard), 442-456 (Victorines), 473-476 (xmth cent, theologians), 487 (early Dominicans, 491 (Alex, of Hales etc.), 506-509 (St. Bonaventure).

ID Special AUGUSTINISMS. —«) Teaching on^nwe. Early writers: II) 134-135 (St. Leo), 176-177 (doctrinal synthesis), 184-190 (St. Prosper 193-196 (St. Fulgentius), 203-207 (St. Cesarius). In the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, II, 381-382 (ixth cent.), 398 (St. Anselm), 432-433 (St. Bernard), 589 (St. Thomas). Council of Trent, 751-755 (Augustinian Schools), 759-763 (Augustinian Congruism). See *Congruism,* n. 73. — *b}* Teaching on the *Church:* I, 703-706 (St. Augustine): II, 144 (St. Gelasius), 139-141 (St. Leo), 681-683 (xivth cent.). — *c) Philosophical teachings:* I, 640-643; 666-669; 714-715; II, 8 (Neo-Platonists), 356-357 (eclecticism), 473-475 (various theories). — *d} Spiritual teachings :* See *Schools of Spirituality,* n. 130.

C) Very special Augustinism or Augustinianism. — Definition, I, 714; II, 35θ, General system, II, 358, 487, 639-641 *(Ægidian School),* 672-673 (xivth cent, various), 729-730 (Renaissance). Special system on grace, 762 (Noris, Berti).

Z?) Pseudo-Augustinisms : II, 162 (Lucidus), 717-722 (Luther), 864 (Jansenism). See *Predestinationism,* n. 41 and *Protestantism,* n. 44.

B) PHILOSOPHY.

10. Schools of Philosophy. — Early writers and the *Logos,* I, 120-122. Platonism : I, 168-171 (Neo-Platonists, Alexandrians); II, 384-385 (Scotus Eriugena), 39°'39I (universals) 387 (Berengarius of Tours), 4,3'4I5 (School of Chartres), 715-716 (Renaissance). — *Aristotelianism :* II, 366-367 (Middle Ages), 476-478 (Arabian) 478-479 (first adaptations), 488-490 (Albert the Great), 536-537, 571-574 (St. Thomas), 716 (Renaissance). See *Scholasticism,* n. 11, and *Schools 0] Theology,* n. 8-9.

11. Scholasticism. — *First beginnings,* 1, 669-671 (St. Augustine); II, 219-22l (Boethius), 224 (Cassiodorus), 263 (St. Isidore), 374-375 (Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus) 376-377 (Compilations), 389-393 (xith cent.). *Pioneers,* II, 406-407 (St. Anselm), 420-421 (Abelard). Moderating influence of St. Bernard, 11, 431-432. Other xiith cent, masters, lì, 441 sq. (School of St. Victor), 456 sq. (P. Lombard), 469-470 (Universities in the Xlllth cent.). *Zenith* of early scholasticism : 480 sq., various authors : 497, St. Bonaventure, II, 526 sq., St. Thomas : renewal of scholasticism by Ihomism, 570-576 and 634. Scotist scholasticism, II, 646-650. *Decadence,* II, 662-664 (xivth cent.), 664-668 (Occamism .

714 (anti-scholastic humanism), 726-727 (Renaissance scholasticism), 738 sq. (Dominicans), 763 (Jesuits). See *Schools of Theology,* n. 8-9. Opponents *oí* scholasticism : II, 392 (St. Peter Damian), 462-463 (Walter of St. Victor).

12. Christian philosophical systems : *Augustinism* is not a philosophical system, II, 356-357.— *Thoniisin,* II, 577-586 (basic principles), 577-578 (intellectual knowledge), 578-581 (first ideas and principles), 581 (actuality and potentiality), 581 (essence and existence), 582-583 (substance and accidents), 583 (matter and form), 583-584 (movement). Other details: 585-589 (Theodicy), 591-593 (Creation, Providence), 593-594 (Angels), 594-597 (Man). Moral philosophy, see *Moral Theology,* n. 103 sq. — *Other leading philosophical systems:* II, 509-516 and 522-524 (St. Bonaventure, common philosophy and mystical philosophy), 650-652 (Duns Scotus), 781-784 (Suarez).

13. The Soul. — *Origin:* I, 214 (creation *ab (eterno}* Origen's opinion opposed by St. Peter of Al., 278; St. Methodius, 285. St. Augustine's opinion, 642, 685; II, 146 (generationism. — *b) Nature,* I, 238, Tertullian's theory; Platonic theory of Clement of Al., 190 (trichotomy), of Nemesius 496. Pure spirituality of the soul according to St. Augustine, I, 624, 642; II, 179-180 (Claudianus Mamertus), 223 (Cassiodorus), 264 (St. Isidore) 308 (St. Maximus) 666 (Ockham).— *c) Immortality :* the Apologists I, no: St. Greg, of Nyssa, 428; St. Augustine, 642: II, 479 (Averroism) 716, (Renaissance), 742 (Cajetan).

14. Knowledge. — Theory of ideas : 1, 643; II, 515 (St. Augustine). In the Middle Ages : Augustinians, II, 358 (illumination in general), 473 (intuitionism), 513-516 (St. Bonaventure; con tuition), 496 (iliumin ism; Roger Bacon); 573 and 578 (St. Thomas); 643 (Godfrey of Fontaines). Voluntarism, 643 (Henry of Ghent), 649-652 (Duns Scotus), 666 (Ockham).

15. Liberty. — Demonstration, I, 198 (Origen, Peri-Archon); 238 (Tertullian); 285 (St. Methodius); 283 (St. Ephraem, the image of God). See in the ivth cent., the adversaries of Manichaeism, 369 and the Cappadocians, 442. In the West, see chiefly *St. Augustine;* very intransigent teaching against Manichaeans, 622; freedom not destroyed by concupiscence, 633 (against Julian), or by grace, 635, 692 (against Semipelagians); St. Augustine distinguishes the *free-will* and *libertas* (perfect liberty) of Adam 679, and the perfect, 680. Free-will and predestination, 688. Various treatises : II, 398, 400-403 (St. Anselm), 427, 432-433 (St. Bernard). 719 (Erasmus against Luther). The free act, II, 597 and 599 (St. Thomas). Liberty and grace, sec *Grace,* n. 71, and the adversaries *oferrors on grace,* n. 44.

16. Personality. Early speculations regarding the hypostasis in Trinitarian theology, I, 436 (St. Basil). See *Consubstanliality,* n. 57. The person in Christology, II, 10-14 (various definitions), 34-35 (St. Cyril), 75-76 (Leontius Byzant.), 220 (Boethius). — According to the Fathers, II, 584 and 592, 624-626 (St. Thomas, Capreolus), 658 (Duns Scotus), 742 (Cajetan), 784 (Suarez).

17.Religiosity. — Definitioni, 20 (natural sentimentality); II, 360 and 868 (to be distinguished from mysticism) : see *Mystical Theology,* n. 78, and *False mysticism,* n. 47. Non-Christian theories, I, 170

(Neo-Platonism); II, 478 (Pantheism), 692 (false spirituals), 718-721 (Luther). Humanist theories, II, 716 (Renaissance), 725 (Erasmus). Human love transfigured by divine love, II, 436 (St. Bernard), 810 (St. Teresa), 848 and 859 (St. Francis of Sales).

18. Humanism. — *The Fathers,* I, 291 and 386 (general outline), 419, 432 and 445 (Cappadocians) 481 (St. John Chrysostom), 496 (Synesius), 498 (St. Isidore *of* Pelusium), 521 and 527 (St. Ambrose), 554 (Prudentius), 579 (St. Jerome), 664 (St. Augustine); II, 156 (St. Ennodius); 217-220 (Boethius), 222 (Cassiodorus). — *After the Fathers,* II, 369 (general outline), 413 (Xllth cent.), 464 (John of Salisbury), 712 (Renaissance), 717 (Christian humanism), 841 (St. Francis of Sales), Influence on theology, see *Schools of theology,* n. 8-9. Moralism of the humanists, II, 716, 725, 790, 845 and 860.

19. Reason and Faith. — Early study of their connection, I, 109 (Apologists), 124 (St. Justin), 142 (St. Irenaeus). Special tendencies */// the East,* 179 and 185 (Clement of Alex.), 204 (Origen), 432 sq. (Cappadocians), 471-472 (St. John Chrysostom), 496 (various), 298 (early schools); *in the West,* 222 (Hippolytus), 246 (Tertullian), 271 (Lactantius), 329 (Victorinus), 360 (St. Hilary), 671 (St. Augustine); II, *75'77* (Leontius Byzant.), 167-170 (St. Vincent of Lerins), 220 (Boethius), 331 (St. John Damascene). — In the Middle Ages, II, 366 (general outline), 389 (mistrust), 404-406 (St. Anselm), 446 (Hugh of St. X^ictor), etc. See *Scholasticism,* n. 11; 473 (the Augustinians); 490 (St. Albert the Great), 505 (St. Bonaventure), 525 (two mentalities); 569 sq. (Thomism). See *Schools of Theology,* n. 8-9. Renaissance, II, 7T4 (general outline), 722 (Lutheranism), 725 (Christian humanism), 739 sq. (Dominicans), 764 sq. (Jesuits). See *Humanism,* n. 18.

C) HOLY SCRIPTURE.

20. Scriptures, source of the teaching. — The Apostolic Fathers, I. 32-33; 'n .St· Justin. 127; St. Ireneus, 142, 151; Clement of Alex., 189-190; Origen, 203-204; Tertullian, 246; St. Cyprian, 257. In the ivth cent., see Schools of Alexandria and Antioch, 297-300: St. Athanasius, 351 ; St. Hilary, 361; the Cappadocians, 433; St. John Chrysostom, 485; St. Ambrose, 522, 528, 540; St. Jerome 5S7 sq.; St. Augustine, 653, 658, 666. Holy Scripture is the first of the *loci Micologici,* II, 745 sq. (Melchior Cano).

21. Canon of the Scriptures. — *Old Testament:* Origen, I, 196-197 (deuter.o-canonical) : 280 (J. Africanus); 580 (St. Jerome). — *New Testament:* canon of Muratori, 155-156 (Alogi, 106).— *The Canon as a whole:* St. Augustine, I, 666. Errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 457. Apocrypha, 156-165. Gelasian Decree, I, 524; 11, 144; decree of the Council of Trent, II, 725 (Session iv).

22. Text of the Scriptures. — *Revisions :* 1, 187-188 (Origen), 281 (Lucian); 573-574, 5θo*58] (St. Jerome). *Translation:* 581 (St. Jerome). Re-arrangements or synopses *of* the Gospels : 130, 375, 380 (Tati.in); 325 (Eusebius). *Poetical adaptations :* 548 (Proba, Sedulius); 554 (Juvencus). *Biblical anthologies : 257,* 262 (St. Cyprian); 412 (St. Basil); 653 (St. Augustine).

23. Exegesis. Biblical senses.—*a) Preliminary definitions:* true scriptural senses, I, 29; spiritual accommodations, I, 29. *b) Alexandrian teaching,* 1, 199 *{Peri-Archon, IVi;* Origen's exegetical method, 206-209; allegorism, 207 sq.; mystical basis, 203-204; advantages and dangers, 208-209. Chief representatives (in varying degree) of this School : Alexandrians of the Hird cent., 264 sq.; St. Athanasius, 349; Didymus, 402; Cappadocians, 432; St. Ambrose, 522, 539; St. Jerome, 581-585; St. Augustine, 639. *Adversaries of Allegorism :* St. Peter of Alexandria, I, 279; St Lucian, 270; St. Methodius, 285; St. Eustathius, 319; the Antiochians, 298 sq. — *c) School of Antioch:* St. Lucian, I, 281. The theory of the School, 453 (Diodorus); 457 (Theodore); 498 (Adrian, St. Isidore of Pelusium). Other leading representatives *of* the School : St. Ephraem, 380; Apollinarius, 449; St. John Chrysostom, 485; St. Jerome, 484; Ambrosiaster, 605; St. Augustine, 663, 669.— *d)* Perfect understanding of the Scriptures is a gift of God, I, 125 (St. Justin); 203 (Origen); 353 (St. Athanasius); 585 Cassian); 663, 669 (St. Augustine). See the *Higher Graces,* n. 75. — *e) Various theories:* II, 165 (St. Eucherius); 240 and 252 (St. Gregory 555 (St. Thomas); 741 (Cajetan).

24. Value of the Scriptures. — Exaggerated allegorism of the Pseudo-Barnabas, I, 78. Aristides' poor opinion of the Jews, in. Bible anterior to Pagan writings: 119, 123 (St. Justin); 131 (Tatian); 134 (St. Theophilus); 184 (Clement of Alex.). Argument from prophecy in Aristo, 113; St. Justin, 118-119. See the *Apologies against the fews* n. 39, and refutations of the *Manichaeans.* Errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia on Messianism, 449.

25. Homilies. — *a)* Principles in St. Augustine, I, 653, 658. — *b)* Chief homelists· Origen, I, 196-197; St. Basil, 413; St. Gregory of Nyssa, 429; St. John Chrys., 478; St. Ambrose, 529; St. Augustine, 656. See also 222 (Hippolytus); 326 (Eusebius); 381 (St. Ephraem, poetical homilies); 494 (Severian of Gabala); 496 (Asterius); 581 (St. Jerome). End *of* the Patristic epoch: 11, 26-27 (St. Cyril of Alex.); 239 sq. (St. Greg, the Great); 275 (St. Bede); 311 (St. Maximus); 324 (various). See also St. Bernard, 425 and 439.

26. Commentaries. — *a) Original early works;* leading authors : Origen, I, 197; Eusebius of Caes., 325; St. Athanasius, 346; St. Hilary, 359; St. Ephraem, 382; St. Gregory of Nyssa, 428; Diodorus, 454; Theodore of M., 458; Ambrosiaster, 6o5;St. Jerome, 581; St. Augustine 655; II, St. Cyril of Alex., 25; Theodoret, 46; St. Gregory the Great, 239; St. Isidore, 261; St. Bede, 275; St. John Damascene 332. *Other authors,* I, 134 (St. Theophilus of Ant.); 180 (Clement of Alex.); 221 (Hippolytus); 274 (Reticius); 274 (Victorious of Pettau); 496 (Polychronius); 565 (Rufinus); II, 104 (various authors). — *b) Catenae:* general outline, II, 6; 104 (School of Gaza); St. Thomas, 553. — *c. Medieval theological commentaries:* 11, 470 sq.; St. Bonaventure, 501 sq.; St. Albert the Great, 490; St. Thomas, 553 sq.

D) TRADITION.

27. Tradition, — *a*J Apostolic Fathers, 1, 75 (Presbyters). Principes of St. Irenaeus, 147-148; Origen, 204; Tertullian, 236, 246: prescrip-

lion). *" N¿hil innovetur, nisi quod traditum est", of* St. Stephen, 261. Tradition in the I Vili cent., 303 and 433-434· — *h)* S. Ephraem's traditional sense, 384; Cappadocians, 433; St. John Chrys., 484; St. Jerome, 588; St. Augustine, 666; also the Traditionalist School, 300. Exception of Theodore of M., 457, and the heretics, see *Doctrinal Errors.* — *Oral Tradition:* in Apostolic times, I, 75; in the I Vth cent., 303, 433, 434. Misuse, in Clement of Al., 188. — Written Tradition, see *Fathers,* n. 34. *Vehicles of Tradition,* see the following sections. Tradition is one of the *loci theologici* , II, 746 (Melchior Cano).

28. **Rites.**— Liturgical customs possess *doctrinal importance,* I, 301, 433'434- Infant baptism, 630. Some *liturgical documents'.* Didache, I, 45-46, 49-50: 1st Apology of Justin, 119, 128; Apostolic Tradition, 224; St. Cyril's Catecheses, 367; Apostolic Constitutions, 373; Peregrinatio Silviae, 567; Dionysius the Areopagite, II, 90. — Sacramentarles : Serapion, I, 370; Latin, II, 135 (Leonine), 145 (Ge'asian), 242 (Gregorian). St. Gregory's liturgical work, 11,341. The *Opus Dei* in the Benedictine Order, 231; at Arles, 207. See *Choral Office,* n. 126. Authors of the office in the Byzantine liturgy : melodists, II, 287; St. Romanns, 289 St. Andrew of Crete, 291; various hymnographers, 293.

29. Creeds. — The Apostles' Creed, I, 37-42; its doctrine, 33-34; commentaries : 565 (Rufinus); 694 (Nicetas); 644, 651, 653. 666 (St. Augustine). — Other creeds : Nicea, 320, 327; Nicea-Constantinople, 424 : see St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 368; St. Epiphanius, 398. Creed of St. Gregory Ihaum., 283. The creed Quicumque, I, 349; 11, 202. Arian pseudo-creeds, I, 2S2. 312. Decision of Ephesus on the creeds, its importance, II, 31.

30. The Magisterium of the Church. The Church possesses the charism of truth, I, 141 (St. Irenaeus); 481 (St. J. Chrysost.); 649-650 (St. Augustine) The Church is the *rule of faith,* 141-142 (St. Irenaeus·; 204 (Origen); 384 (St. Ephraem); 399 (St. Epiphanius); 433 (Cappadocians); 493 (St. John Chrys.); 588 (St. Jerome); 666 (St. Augustine); see also 705. Various *organs* of the magisterium of the Church, sec the following sections.

31. The Holy See. — Its supreme function both from a doctrinal and pastoral viewpoint : see *Roman Church* (doctrinal action), n. 95, and Popes) (doctrinal action, n. 96). Their attitude with regard to Oecumenical Councils, sec Councils, n. 33.

32. Bishops. I he doctrinal function of lhe bishop, I, 66 (S. Ignatius). The bishop is doctor and judge of the faith, 204 (Origen). The living magisterium of lhe Church, 147 (St. Irenaeus); 265 (St. Cyprian). See *Councils,* n. 33. Condition of its value, apostolicity, 147 (St. Irenaeus); 140 (Hcgesippus). Duties of the bishop, see *Priesthood,* etc., n. 131 sq.

33. Councils. —*a)* Origins of conciliary action : the first councils, I, 143, 153. African councils, 259 sq. The episcopal college according to St. Cyprian, 265. In the ivth cent., 293, 301, 307. Council of Nicea, 301, 320, 327, 318. Council of Sardica, 339. 1st Council of Constantinople, 418, 425. African councils in the time of St. Augustine, 622, 630-633. Distinction of general and particular councils, 434, (Cappadocians); 705 (St. Augustine). 'Treatises *De Synodis,* 346 (St. Atha-

nasius) 358 (St. Hilary). — *b) Early councils from the Vth ceni.: Oecumenical:* Ephesus, π, 29-32; Chalcedon, 54-57 and 128-130 : I Ind Constantinople, 84-86; Hird Constantinople, 302; I Ind Nicea, 319; IVth Constantinople, 380. Other *various* councils : on the pseudo-council of Ephesus A. D. 449, see II, 54 and 128: and the synod *in Trullo*. II, 280. Important doctrinal decisions of Council of Orange, 203 sq. Councils of Toledo, II 256; especially the IVth, 258.

34. The Fathers. — Definition, I, 1-3. Fathers and Doctors of the Church, 3.— Patrology: definition, I, 1; object, 4-6; general method and divisions, 6-9; importance, 9-12; texts and collections, 12-15; studies on the Fathers, 14-19. Apostolic Fathers : character of their writings, 31-33; teaching, 33-37. Apostolic writings: see *Index to Authors.* Theological arguments drawn from the Fathers, 301. St. Augustine, 666. First writing on the Fathers, 14, 585 *{De viris illustribus,* (St. Jerome).

E) APOLOGETICS AND CONTROVERSY.

35. The Apologists. — Definition, I, 108-109. Division, 109. Interest of the works, 109. Teaching on the Word, 109. Immortality of the soul, i to. *First apologists against the Pagans,* in the iind cent. : Quadratus, no, Aristides, in sq.; Ep. to Diognetus 113 sq.; St. Justin, 114 sq.; Tatian, 130 sq.; Athenagoras, 131 sq.; St. Theophilus of Antioch, 133 sq.; Miltiades, Apollinarius, Melito, 134-135; Hermias, 135; Minucius Felix, 136 sq.

36. Apologetics in the Hird century. — Chiefly reppesented by : Clement of Alex., 180; Origen, 199; Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 234-235; St. Cyprian, 256, 260; Commodian, 269; Arnobius, 270; Lactantius, 271-273; St. Methodius, 285.

37. Apologetics in the IVth century. — Chief authors : Eusebius, 320, 325, 326; St. Athanasius, 345; St. Greg. Naz. 421; S. Greg, of Nyssa, 426-427; Apollinaris, 448; St. John Chrysost., 476; Macarius Magnés-495; St. Ambrose, 524; Prudentius, 555-556; P. Orosius, 561; St. Augustine, 644, 648 sq.

38. Early Apologetics after the IVth century. — Leading writers : St. Cyril of Alex., II, 23; Theodorct, 44; Salvian, 159; St. John Damascene. In the Middle Ages, in addition to Raymond Lulle, 496, *Summa contra Gentiles* (purpose, and plan).

39. Apologetics against the Jews. — Epistle of the Pseudo-Barnabas, 78-79; Aristo of Pella. 112-113; St. Justin, 118-119; Miltiades, 134; Apollinarius, 135; St. Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 235; Eusebius, 325; St. John Chrysost., 479; Prudentius, 555.

40. Controversy. Definition, 1, 108, 138, 139 (distinction between apologetics and controversy). Fundamental principles of controversy : *Rule offaith,* I, 144-146 (St. Irenaeus); tradition 235-239 (Tertullian, *De prascriptione haereticorum);* the canon of St. Vincent of Lerins, II, 168 *(Commonitorium).* Compiete theory of the *Loci theologici,* 746 (Melchior Cano). Early lists of heresies, I. 144-146 (St. Irenaeus); 222 (Hippolytus);

398 (St. Epiphanius); 604 (Philastrius); 637, (St. Augustine); II, 322 (St. Germanus); 332 (St. John Damascene). Chief *controversialists,* see adversaries of errors mentioned in nos. 41-47.

F) DOCTRINAL ERRORS COMBATED BY THE FATHERS AND THE DOCTORS.

41. Errors regarding God and the world.

a) Gnosticism, 1, 100-104. Nature, 100-101. Doctrinal synthesis, 102. History and division : 102-104. Gnostic apocrypha, 160. Acts, 164.— *Adversaries :* St. Ignatius, 70; St. Theophilus of Antioch, 134; Rhodo, Hegesippus, 140; St. Irenaeus, 144 sq.; Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 237; *De recta in Deum fide,* 287; St. Methodius, 285. — *b)* Marcioniam, I, 104 (Origin, teaching, organisation); *Adversaries:* Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 237; Prudentius, 555; St. Augustine, 624. — *c)* Manichaeism. 170 (Origin, teaching, organisation); *Adversaries,* 369 (various); 403, (Didymus); 555 (Prudentius); 616, 622-624 (St. Augustine). Medieval Manichaeism of the Cathari and Albigenses, II, 480. — *d)* Priscillianism, Definition, I, 296; 606-607, origin, teaching; *Adversaries,* 1,607; see Augustine, 624. *e)* Religious syncretism, 167; Mithraism, 168; Neo-Platonism, 168-170 are all new forms of Paganism. —*f)* Pantheism in the Middle Ages : II, 480 (Averroism); Amalricians, 480. See also *False Mysticism,* 11. 47. — Predestinationism : 11, 172 (the error of Lucidus) and 381 (Gottschalk).

42. Errors regarding the trinity.

a) Unitarianism, see *Modahsm* and *Adoptionism.* — *b)* Modalism. also called Monarchianism, Patri-passianism, Sabellianism, 1, 173-176 (definition, partisans, teaching). *Adversaries :* Hippolytus, 222-223; Tertullian, 237-239; Dion, of Alex., 276. — *c)* Adoptianism, 175 (definition, propagators). Paul of Samosata, 175-176 (his teaching on the ὁμοούσιο , his condemnation). See Lucian, 281. *Adversaries :* Hippolytus, 222; Malchion, 281. — *d)* Arianism. Historical development, I, 307-312. *Propagators :* Arius, 313-314; Eusebius of Nicomedia, 314; Asterius, 315. *Leaders of the main factions:* Anomoeans, 316; Homoeans, 316; Homoiousians or Semi-Arians, 317-318. Historians, 318-319. Eusebius of Cesarea, 319-327.—*Adversaries :* the first, 327-367; various, St. Athanasius, St. Hilary, St. Cyril *of* Jerusalem. End of the IVth cent., in the East, 398 sq. : Didymus, Cappadocians, Antiochians etc. : in the West 522-533 (St. Ambrose), 637, 645-648 (St. Augustine). End of the Patristic period, II, 22 and 23 (St. Cyril of Alex.), 191 (St. Fulgentius). — *e)* Photinism, I, 315, 330. —*J)* Pneumatomachi, I, 285, 320; *Adversaries :* the Cappadocians, 409 sq., (St. Basil), 416 sq. (St. Greg. Naz), 424 sq. (St. Greg, of Nyssa), 444 (general outline). —*g)* Photianism, en or regarding the procession of the Holy Ghost : II, 379 (Photius), 689 (Byzantine polcmists). *Adversaries:* the popes, II, 380; St. Anselm, 401 ; St. Thomas, 552 ; 700 (various).

43. Errors concerning Christ, Mary, and images.

a) Judseo-Christians, I, 99-100. Writings: I, 159-160 (apocryphal gospels); 163 (preaching of Peter); 54 (Clementines). *Adversaries :*

Apostolic Fathers, 35; St. Ignatius, 70; see also Prudentius, 555. — *b)* Docerism, combated by Apostolic Fathers, I, 34 (general outline). 70 (St. Ignatius). See also 104, 162, 190, 237, 363. — *c)* Alogi, 1, 106; 139 (Caius). *Adversary :* St. Hippolytus, 222. — *d)* Apollinarianists, 296 and 449-452; beginnings, 449; historical development, 449-450; doctrinal system, 451. The sect, 452. *Adversaries :* St. Athanasius, 342, 348; St. Epiphanius, 339; Cappadocians, 410 sq.; Antiochians, 454 sqq.; St. Cyril of Alexandria, II, 22. —*e)* Nestorianism : forerunners, 1,454-460 (Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore Mops.); Nestorius, II, 16-20 (the man, his writings and teaching). Theodoret, 46. Nestorianism in Syria, 48 sq. *Adversaries :* St. Celestine I, II, 28; St. Cyril of Alex., 26-33 (before the Council of Ephesus, at the Council, after the Council). School of Edessa, 48 sq. Justinian's part in the Three Chapters question, 84-86. Influence of Vigilius, Pelagius etc., 150-154. — *f)* Monophysitism : beginnings, denounced by Theodoret, II, 45. Eutyches, 52; Dioscurus, 54. Various forms of the heresy; strict form, 58; mitigated form, 59. Centres : Constantinople (Acacius' schism) 59-62; Alexandria, 63-65; Antioch, 67 (Severian Monophysitism; the Jacobite church). The Armenian Monophysites, 120. *Adversaries:* St. Leo, 53-55, 128-130, and 129. Various authors, 71; Leontius Byzant., 73. Justinian, see 81-85. Last adversaries, 295-298. —*g)* Monotheletism : beginnings, 11, 297; great controversies, 298; teaching, 298-300. Attitude of Pope Honorius, 301. *Adversaries :* the popes, 298 and 302; St. Sophronius 303; St. Maximus, 306. — *h)* Adoptianism (Christological) II, 380. — *i)* Antidico-Marianites, 1, 400. See also 432 (Bonosius), 577 (Helvidius).—*j)* Iconoclasm : beginnings, 316; historical development, 317. *Adversaries :* St. Germanus, 321 ; other patriarchs, 323; St. John Damascene, 328, 335; St. Theodore of Studium, 343 sq.

44. Errors concerning grace and the sacraments.

a) Pelagianism. I, 391 (general conspectus on the teaching and the teachers). See also 579 and 630 (impeccantia); 459 (Theodore of Mopsuestia). *Adversaries:* Popes, I, 618; St. Augustine, 630-635. See also 560 (P. Orosius); 578, 591 (St. Jerome); II, 123 (St. Leo). — *b)* Semi-Pelagianism : Teaching, I. 601-603 (Cassian); 11, 162 (Provengáis); Protagonists, II, 164 (general outline), 165 (St. Hilary), 170 (Vincent of Lerins), 171 sq. (Faustus of Riez); 174 (Arnobius the Younger). *Adversaries :* St. Augustine, I, 635-637; the Augustinians in general, II, 176-177 (doctrine); St. Prosper, 184; St. Fulgentius; 191 St. Caesarius 203. — *c)* Determinism, end of the Middle Ages, II, 667. See also *Predeterminationism* and *Protestantism.* — *d)* Protestantism : Luther, II, 717-722; his teaching, 721-722. Varieties of Protestantism, 722-723. *Adversaries:* Popes, 725-726. Leading controversialists, 73ï·73θ· — *e)* Jansenism, 11, 864.

45. Errors concerning the Church and discipline.

a) Quartodecimans, 1, 140, 143, 153. — *b)* Novatianism, 1, 252-254 (origin, error regarding the Church and sin). *Adversaries :* St. Cyprian, 258; Reticius, 274; St. J. Chrysostom, 466; St. Ambrose, 533; St. Pacianus, 606. *c)* Donatism, 1, 296, 389-391 (general outline of its teaching and growth). *Adversaries :* St. Optatus, 608; St. Augustine, 625-629. — *d)* Luciferianism, 1, 332. Writers of this sect, 333. St. Jerome's

opposition, 576. — *e)* Doctrines regarding Church and State : 11, 678-680 (extreme and moderate theories). *Adversaries :* 681-684 (various authors). —*f)* Conciliary theories, II, 685-686 (their occasion); d'Ailly and Gerson, 686-687.

46. Errors regarding the Last Ends.

a) Millenarianism, I, I, 106, 77 (Papias); 128 (St. Justin); 153 (St. Irenaeus), 163 (apocryphal gospels); 269 (Commodianus); 274 (-Victorious of Pettau); 273 (Lactantius); 276, 279 (Nepos). *Adversaries :* Origen, 213, St. Dionys. of Alex., 276; St. Augustine, 711. See also *Montanism,* j05 106. — *b)* Origenism, 217-220. See 213, 296. Followers: Didymus, 404; Evagrius, 507; see also 280, (Pamphilius); 320 (Eusebius); 562 (Rufinus); 590 (St. Jerome); 547 (St. Ambrose). *Adversaries :* 279 (St. Peter of Alex.); 285 (St. Methodius); (329 St. Eustathius); 396 (St. Epiphanius); *The great Origenist controversy :* 396-397, 468-469 (St. J. Chrysostom); 496 (Theophilus); 562-563 (Rufinus); 574-575 (St. Jerome); 516 (St. Anastasios I). St. Augustine's teaching, 711.

47. Errors concerning Christian Life.

a) Encratism, I, 107; Tatian, 130; Eustathius *of* Seb, 318; Amphilochius, 431; see also Hermas, 90. *b)* Montanism, 1, 105-106 (teaching, sects). Tertullian, 231 sq. *Adversaries:* 139 (Cains, various); 222 (Hippolytus). — *c)* Jovinian's Laxism, 577; Vigilantius, 577. — *d)* False Mysticism, early errors: 203, 431 (Euchites); medieval, 11, 692 *(Waidenses, Joachimites, Apostolic Brethren, Spintuais, Fraticelli, Beçuins, Beghards);* modern, II, 790 *(Alumbrados).* Master Eckhart's errors, 703. *Lutheranism* is also a pseudo-mysticism, 720-721. For sentimental naturalism, wrongly termed "mysticism", see *Religiosity,* n. 17.

II. DATA CONCERNING THE FAITH (DOGMA).

A) GOD.

48.The knowledge of God. — *a) Idea 01 God* in the apologies of Aristides, I, 111 ; Athenagoras, 133. Possibilities of knowing Him, 126 (St. Justin); moral conditions, 134 (St. Theophilus), *b) Existence 0/ God* proved by the order found in the world, m Aristides; Minucius, 137; by the changing character of beings, St. Augustine, 672; by the degrees of perfection, St. Augustine, 672; by eternal truths, 673; by universal consent, 672. — *c) God is transcendant* but knowable, St. Justin, 126. Affirmative and negative theology, 189. God cannot be adequately understood, 414, 478. Perfect knowledge of God, or the Gnosis, 186. Reality of mystical knowledge, 663-664 (St. Augustine).—*d) Theological syntheses,* II, 331-332, 335-336, (St.John Damascene); 384-385 (Scotus Eriugena); 394 sq., *St. Anselm:* existence of God, 398-400, 407-408; St. Anselm's argument, 408; divine attributes, 409. Richard -of St. Victor, 453; William of Auvergne, 482. *St. Bonaventure :* exemplarism, 510-511; existence of God, 516-517; contemplation, 521-525. *St. Thomas,* transcendental value of principles, 580; the five ways, 586. *Duns Scotus,* 652; *Suarez,* 785. Infused natural knowledge, see *Mystical theology,* n. 78.

49. The Divine Attributes. — *a) The unity of God,* i, 133, Athenagoras; 137, Minucius; 148-149; St. Irenaeus; 237, Tertullian : 272, Lactantius. See all the *Apologists.* See also the controversialists who refuted *Marcionism, Manichaeism* and *Monarchianism,* n. 42. — *V) Divine simplicity,* Tertullian, 247; St. Augustine, 617, 624. See 663. — *c) The Goodness of God,* St. Irenaeus, 145; see all the adversaries of *Gnosticism* and *Manichaeism.* St. Augustine's teaching on this point, 624,674.—¿Z) *Truth and Wisdom,* St. Augustine, 643,663, 674. See below, the work of the six days of Creation *(Creation)* and *Providence, e) Divine impassibility,* Lactantius, 273; St. Greg. Thaum., 284; God, *last end* of man, St. Ambrose, 541; his happiness, St. Augustine, 698. See *Foundations of Morality,* n. 105.—*/) Theological systems.* The Divine Names, II, 87, 96 and 88 (Dionys. the Areopagite); 409 (St. Anselm); 453 sq. (Richard of St. Victor); 510 and 699 (St. Bonaventure); 579 and 593 (St. Thomas); 684 (Duns Scotus); 641 (Henry of Ghent. — Scientia media, see *Predestination,* n. 53.

50. Creation. – *a)* Refutations of *various errors:* St. Irenaeus, I, 145; Tertullian, 237. *Ex nihilo,* St. Justin, 126; Clement of Alex., 190; eternal creation, Origen 213; in time, St. Methodius, 285; St. Augustine, 676. — *b) Creation by the Word,* Apologists, 110; St. Justin, 126; Hippolytus, 227. See the Word, n. 55. Creation, work of the Trinity, 189-190 (Clement of Alex.); 676 (St. Augustine); *c) The work oj six days,* I, 275 (Victorinas of Pettau); 413 (St. Basil): 428 (St. Greg, of Nyssa); 529 (St. Ambrose); 676 (St. Augustine); goodness of the Creation, 272 (Lactantius); 624, 654 (St. Augustine). Creation the image of God, 643, 663, 671, 685 (St. Augustine); source of poetical inspiration, 553 (St. Paulinus); II, 209 (poem of St. Avitus); 215 (Dracontius). — i?) *Various syntheses:* II, 260 (St. Isidore); 442 (Hugh of St. Victor); 501, 511 (St. Bonaventure); 592 (St. Thomas).

51. Creatures. — *a)* Angels. Gnostic errors refuted, I, 145 (St. Irenaeus); Origin and division of angels, 199, 213 (Origen); their spirituality, II, 99 (general outline); 179 (Cl. Mamertus) : 264 (St. Isidore), hierarchies, 100 (Dionys. the Areopagite); 244 (St. Greg, the Great); 596 (St. Thomas). Theological systems, 594 (three chief ones). Angels and the government of the world, see *Providence,* n. 53. *Guardian angels,* I, 96 (Hermas); II, 100 (Dionysius the Areop.); 244 (St. Greg, the Great); 426 (St. Bernard) : 596 (St. Thomas). *Devils,* sec *Spiritual Combat,* n. 120.—*b)* Man. Thomist synthesis: man in general, 594-595; his faculties, 577; knowledge 596; human acts, 577; dignity of man. 576. See the *soul,* n. 13.

52. Providence. — *a) Various aspects.* Harmony of the world, I, 55 (Clementines); III (Aristides); 137 (Minucius); Evil has its place in the order willed by God, 641, 676 (St. Augustine). God punishes moral evil, 273 (Lactantius); 477 (St. John Chrysost.). Providential meaning of suffering, 477 (St. J. Chrysost.). Divine Providence in lelation to the Stale, 561 (P. Orosius); 644 (St. Augustine); relative to children who die unbaptised, 428 (St. Greg, of Nyssa). Providence and the Barbarian invasions, I, 641 (St. Augustine), 11, 159 (Salvian); 236 (St. Gregory). — *¿) Theology:* II, 336 (St. J. Damascene); 593 (St. Thomas). See *Predestination,* n. 5^.

53. Predestination. — i) Various Patristic data Two wills in God, I, 489 (St. J. Chrysost.). Predestination synonymous with foreknowledge, I, 602 (Cassian); II, 161 (School of Lerins) 171 (Faustus). Predestinarían error, II, 171 (Lucius); 381 (Gottschalk). — *St. Augustine s teaching:* brief outline, I, 688; *Augustinian viewpoint: a)* the fact known by faith, 690; gratuity of salvation and merit, 691 ; God wills the salvation of all, 692; the two wills, 692; *b)* Free-will and predestination, 692; r) the essential solution of the mystery : fundamental attributes of God : Truth, Wisdom, Goodness, 693. Advantages of this teaching, 694; its dangers, 685. *Defenders tá* this teaching, II, 176 (general outline); 189 (St. Prosper); 194 (Eastern Scythian monks); 197-198 (St. Fulgentius); 203 sq. (St. Caesarius); 244 (St. Gregory); 265 (St. Isidore). — 2) Theological syntheses. Simple elements, II, 337 (St. John Damascene); ixth cent, discussions: 381 (Hincmar etc.); 590 (St. Thomas); 655 (Duns Scotus); 743 (favelli); 744 (Catharinus). Predestination to glory *in se,* 758. Predestination and *scientia media,* II, 766 (founders of the system), 767 sq., protagonists; 772 explanation. See *Molinism,* n. 73.

B) TRINITY.

54.The three Persons. — Fundamental traditional data, I, 37 sq., (Creed), 33 (Apostolic Fathers), 95 (defects in Hermas). — Theological development, see below. Indwelling of the three Persons in the soul, 11, 39 (St. Cyril). Union with the three Persons, consummation of mystical prayer, II, 822 (St. Teresa).

55. The Word. — «) *The Word* or *Christ is truly God,* the Son of God: I, 33, 34 (Apost. Fathers); 41 (Creed); 55 (Clementines); 70 (St. Ignatius); no (Apologists); 112 (Aristo); 118, 127 (St. Justin); 149 (St. Irenaeus); 190 (St. Clement of Alex.); 199, 211 (Origen); See also the defenders of *consubstantiality,* 01 theologians of the *Trinity.* — *b)* The Word is often regarded as *Creator:* no (Apologists); 126 (St. Justin); 173 (Alexandrians); 213 (Origen); 227 (Hippolytus), r) The Word is also the *Enlightener,* I, no, 126, 150, etc.; see *Names and Functions of Christ,* n. 65. — *d) Various states of the Word,* doubtful theory, no (Apologists); 227 (Hippolytus); 251 (Novatian).—*e) Equal with the Father :* see *Subordinationism,* n. 56. —*f) Unity oj nature* with the Father : see *Consubstantiality.* —*g) Knowledge of the Word:* see *Knowledge of Christ.*

56. Subordinationism. — *Apparent* or relative *subordination of* the Word to the Father: 105 (Apologists); 127 (St. Justin); 133 (Athenagoras); 173 (Alexandrians); 211 (Origen); 247 (Tertullian); 251 (Novatian); error corrected by Dionysius of Alexandria, 278. Lucian of Antioch's tendencies, 282. Absolute and heretical subordinationism : see *Arianism,* n. 42.

57. Consubstantiality. The word ὁμοούσιο , I, 176 (Paul of Samosata); Origen's leaching 211; St. Dionysius, 278; the word and the doctrine at Nicea, 301,320, 322, 327. Adversaries and defenders ; see *Arianism.* In the Schools : Alexandria, 297-298; Antioch, 300. Doctrine of the ὁμοιούσιο (like in substance) 318 (Basil of Ancyra); 327 (Eusebius). Liberius' attitude, 334; St. Athanasius, 341; St. Hilarius, 361; Cappodocians, 435. Substance (οὐσία) and hypostasis (ὑπόστασι); in St. Atha-

nasius, 349; Didymus, 404; Cappadocians, 435. The Cappadocians' important role, 435-437; and chiefly St. Basil, 410.

58. The Holy Ghost. — *a) As Sanctifier;* in St. Irenaeus, I, 152; St. Greg. Naz., 426. See *Grace,* n. 71 sq. Montanist error, 105. Early theological speculation somewhat brief, 127 (St. Justin); 211 (Origen); 239 (Tertullian); 251 (Novatian), *b) Divinity, and consubstantiality* with the Father and the Son defended, either explicitly or implicitly, in the 4th cent, by St. Athanasius, 348, 350; St. Hilary, 363; St. Epiphanius, 399; Didymus, 404; St. Basil 414; St. Greg. Naz., 441 ; St. Greg, of Nyssa, 427; St. Ambrose, 533, 545; St. Jerome 585; St. Nicetas, 604. *c} Mode of Procession :* Eastern point of view, 211, (Origen); 351 (St. Athanasius); 362 (St. Hilary); 438 (Cappadocians); 544 (St. Ambrose); Western point of view, 251 (Novatian); 438 (St. Epiphanius); 675 (St. Augustine). Later writers, II, 308 (St. Maximus), 336 (St. John Damascene) 378 (adding of the *Filioque* to the Creed), 380 (error of Photius), 401 (St. Anselm), 552 (St. Thomas), 689 (general outline of the controversy). Sec *Phbtianism,* n. 42. — *d} Action of the. Holy Ghost in souls,* sec *Gifts of the Holy Ghost,* n. 74. Apex of the spiritual life, submission to the Holy Ghost, II, 618, 622 (St. Thomas), 758 (Thomism), 839 (St. John of the Cross). See *Mystical Theology,* n. 78.

59. Trinitarian theology. — *d) Early writings :* The word Τριά , I, 128-129 (St. Theophilus of Ant.). The " Plenitude of the Divinity", 149 (St. Irenaeus); the divine "economy", 149, 247 (Tertullian). First great treatises on the Trinity: Origen (Peri-Archon), 198; Tertullian, 247; Novatian, 250. In the ivth cent., see all the adversaries of Arianism. *b) Early synthetic explanations :* St. Greg, of Nazianzus' theological discourses, 421-422. St. Augustine's *De Trinitate,* 645-648. Doctrine of relations, 675. Analogies of the Trinity : various natural analogies (bks. ix-xi) 648; wisdom, perfect image of the Trinity (bks. xn-xiv), 648; see also 675. St. Augustine seeks to shew in what the mystery consists rather than to demonstrate it, 671, 675. — The Trinity is an incomprehensible mystery, 484 (St. J. Chrysost.). Sec also, 1, 414 and II, 192 and 196 (St. Fulgentius), 220 (Boethius) —*c) New syntheses,* II, 400, 401, 409, 410 (St. Anselm), 449 (Richard of St. Victor), 518 (St. Bonaventure), 591 (St. Thomas), 655 (Duns Scotus), 742 (Cajetan), 785 (Suarez).

C) CHRIST.

60. Christ. — *Man-God:* this word in Clement of Alex., 190; in St. Augustine, 676. The *same Person* is both God and man : I, 149 (St. Irenaeus); 247 (Tertullian). Tendency of the School of Alexandria to stress this point, 298; contrary tendency of the Anliochians, 300. Error concerning the Person of Christ, I, 454 sq, II, 15 sq. See Nestorianism, n. 43. Traditional communication of characters maintains the unity, I, 34 (Apost. Fathers); 149 (St. Irenaeus); 351 (St. Athanasius); 399 (St. Epiphanius); 438-469 (Cappadocians). Consequences : Θεοτόκο . 400 (See *Our Lady* n. 67). Nestorian error, 460.

61. The Natures of Christ. — Christ-God, see the *Word,* n. 55. Teaching of Prudentius, I, 555 (Apotheosis). Adoptionist error, 377 (Elipandus). Christ-man : true human nature against Docetism, 34

(Apost. Fathers); 70 (St. Ignatius); 237 (Tertullian); Human infirmine-, 149 (St. Ireneus); 363 (St. Hilary). Clement of Alexandria's error, 190; and Origen, 214. Apollinaris' heresy mutilates Christ's human nature, 449. Errors concerning the natures *of* Christ, II, 45 sq., see *Monophysitism* and *Monothelitism,* n. 44. Christ's human nature sanctified by the Holy Ghost, II, 39 (St. Cyril).

62. The Incarnation, or union of the two natures. —*a)* Earia data: I, 70 (St. Ignatius), 149 (St. Irenaeus); the "economy" 140 (St. Irenaeus), 247 (Tertullian), 595 (Cassian), 677 (St. Augustine;. Apollinaris' error, 449, and Theodore of Mops., 459. *Christological terminology:* II, 10-14 (essence, nature, hypostasis, person). Various viewpoints: I, 297 (Alexandrians), 299 (Antiochians): II, 14 (general outline). Error of Apollinaris, I, 449 and other Christological errors, il, 15 sq. See *Apollinansm,* n. 43 etc., Definitions *de fide,* see *Councils,* n. 33. St. Leo the Great, II, 56 and St. Cyril of Alex., II, 37 sq.— *b)* Theological systems: 11, 76 (Leontius Byzant.), 101 Dionys. the Areopagite), 218 (Boethius), 334 (St. John Damascene). *Thomist synthesis,* II, 623, general outline; 624 formal constitutive element of the hypostatic union. *Other syntheses,* 518 (St. Bonaventure), 658 (Duns Scotus), 785 (Suarez). Christological nihilism, 419 (Abelard), 159 (Lombard). *Motives of the Incarnation,* II, 518 (St. Bonaventure), 627 (St. Thomas). See *Redemption,* n. 63.

63. The Redemption. — Gnostic error, 1,102. Traditional teaching: three theories, 352. *a)* Fundamental doctrine *of satisfaction,* I, 128 (St. Justin); 150 (recapitulation, St. Irenaeus); 190 (Clement of Alex.); 214 (Origen); 438 (St. Greg. Naz., St. Basil); 363, 545 (St. Hilary, St. Ambrose); St. Augustine, 677 (humility of God; satisfaction) St. Leo, II, 133. — *b)* Theory of *union:* 352 (St. Athanasius); 439 St. Greg, of Nyssa); 545 (St. Hilary). — *c)* Theory of the *rights of the devil:* 150 (St. Irenaeus); 214 (Origen); 439 (St. Greg, of Nyssa); 545 (St. Ambrose). Rejected by St. Augustine, 677; see also 439 St. Greg. Naz. — *d)* Theory of the *abuse of power* II, 133 (general outline; St. Leo); 264 (St. Isidore), etc.; combated by St. Anselm, 410; Abelard, 419; St. Thomas, 626. — ^ *Theology of the Redemption:* sources, 11, 401-403 and 410 (St. Anselm), 437 (St. Bernard), 518 (St. Bonaventure). Thomist synthesis, 625; motive of the Incarnation, 625; relative necessity, 625; character, 626; teaching of Duns Scotus, 657.

64. Fruits of the Redemption.—See chiefly St. Irenaeus, 1, 150 (reconciliation, divinisation, rebirth, etc.); Clement of Alex., 190 (ransom, rebirth); St. Athanasius, 352 (divinisation, union with the Word, etc.); Cappadocians, 438 sq. — *Universality* of the effects of the Redemption, 214 (Origen); 439 (St. Greg, of Nyssa); 677 (St. Augustine); see also 692. See *Predestination,* n. 53; on grace as fruit of Redemption, see *Grace,* n. 71 sq. — *Scholastic theories* on the equivalence of the satisfaction, II, 626 (St. Thomas), 657 (Duns Scotus).

65. Names and functions of Christ. On the *names* of Christ, see 604 (Nicetas). For His *spiritual presence* in the Christian, see St. Ignatius, 71; Origen, 203; St. Ambrose, 544. On Christ *Saviour,* see Redemption. Christ is the revealer of the mysteries, 150 (St. Irenaeus); the *master* who instructs, 182, 190 (Clem. Alex.). Christ is the tutor, the educator in the school of virtue, 181 (Clement of Alex.).

Christ is a *doctor,* 190 (Clem, of Alex.), 544 (St. Ambrose), 643 (St. Augustine); Christ, *model of humility 667.* Christ is *deifier,* 150 (St. Irenaeus). Christ is the *Spouse of* chaste souls, 216 (Origen; In Can); 406 (Didymus); 429 (St. Greg, of Nyssa); 543 (St. Ambrose). Christ is the *Spouse of the Church,* His mystical body, 384 (St. Ephraem); 703 (St. Augustine). Christ is the vital *centre* of mankind : See Augustine's *City of God,* 676, and 648-659. The human nature of Christ shews *the way,* II, 312 (St. Maximus), 435 and (St. Bernard), 438 (St. Bonaventure) : 812 (St. Teresa). See *Devotion to Christ* n. 124.

66. The Knowledge of Christ. — *The perfect knowledge of Christ* is a consequence of special supernatural graces; St. Ignatius, 73; St. Irenaeus, 152; Clement, 187; Origen, 203; St. Athanasius, 353; Didymus, 406; St. Augustine, 687. See also St. Augustine, contemplative, 662-665, 671 and also 23-24. This perfect knowledge and the spiritual maternity of Our Lady, 203 (Origen). The knowledge of Christ is given through spiritual love but prepared by sensible love, II, 438 sq. (St. Bernard), 524 (St. Bonaventure); 821 (St. Teresa). See *Contemplation,* n. 76.

67. Our Lady.—*a)* The *Co-Redemptrix,* the new Eve, 128 (St. Justin); 151 (St. Irenaeus) : advocate, 151 (St. Irenaeus). See chiefly Augustine, 678. — *b) The Divine Motherhood :* in St. Ignatius, St. Justin, 128; St. Irenaeus, 151; Pierius, 279; St. Epiphanius, 400; St. Augustine, 678. See also, 203, 238, 485. Theodore of Mopsuestia's opposition, 456. Teaching finally fixed by St. Cyril of Alexandria, II, 25-26, 29-32, 36. — *c) Perpetual virginity denied* by Tertullian, 238; Antidicomarianites, 400; Bonosius, 532; Helvidius, Jovinian, 577; affirmed more and more explicitly by St. Ignatius, 128; St. Justin, 128; St. Irenaeus, 151; St. Ephraem, 383; St. Epiphanius, 400; St. Ambrose, 352; St. Jerome, 577; St. Hildephonsus, II, 267. — *d) Holiness:* St. Ephraem, I, 383; St. Ambrose, 543 (Mary, model and patron of virgins); St. Augustine, 678. St. J. Chrysostom's opinion, 485; St. Leo, II, 134; St. Anselm, 403; St. Bernard, 437; St. Bonaventure, 518; St. Thomas, 627.— *e) Immaculate Conception :* more precise study of holiness of Mary, II, 106 (Chrysippus of Jerusalem); 292 (St. Andrew of Crete); 316 (John of Eubaea); 321 (St. Germanus); 323 (St. Tarasius); 420 (Abelard); 657 (Duns Scotus); 670 (Franciscan Order); 789 (Suarez); 789 (St. Louis Bertrand). —*f) Marÿs spiritual maternity* and the perfect knowledge of Christ, 203 (Origen). Mary, dispenser of graces, II, 437. Universal mediation, 627. See *Devotion,* n 124.—^ *Life and death of Mary* according to the apocryphal gospels, I, 161. See also St. Epiphanius, 400; Modestus of Jerusalem, II, 315; St. John Damascene, 333.

68. The Saints. — The first anniversaries : St. Polycarp, 1, 74; the martyrs in general, 289. The great *panegyrists* of the 4th cent. : St. Ephraem, 381; St. Basil, 414; St. Greg. Naz., 421; St. Greg. Nyssa, 429; St. J. Chrysost. 479; St. Ambrose, 529; St. Augustine, 656. See also St. Paulinus, 553; Prudentius, 557. *Hagiographers :* I, 521 (the deacon Paulinus), 611 (St. Possidius); II, 43 (Theodoret), 113 (Cyril of Scythopolis), 214 (Fortunatus), 241 (St. Greg, the Great), 270 (St. Gregory of Tours), 282 sq. (various), 283 (Moschus), 304 (St. Sophronius), 429 (St. Bernard). See also, II, 638 *Golden Legend* of Jacopo de Voragine. Humanist reaction, 714.— *Veneration* of the saints, see n. 69.

69. Veneration. — *Early data :* veneration of the saints, 1, 577, 583 (St. Jerome against Vigilantius); veneration of *images* combated by Eusebius, I, 327; St. Epiphanius, 396, 400. Definition and origin of veneration of image, II, 3I6. — *Doctrinal detail* on veneration in general : 317; 319 Eastern viewpoint; 319 Western viewpoint. Definition of the ilnd Council of Nicea, 320. Discussion in the West, II, 377. See *Iconoclasm,* n. 43.

D) GRACE.

70. Fallen Man. — *Primitive state :* gifts of innocent man, 1, 152; St. Irenaeus; 383, St. Ephraem; 428, 442, Cappadocians; and 678 St. Augustine. — *The Fall. Original sin,* I, 214, Origen; 274, Reticius; 383, St. Ephraem; 442, Cappadocians; 508, Mark the Hermit; 556, Prudentius; and 631, 633, 634 and 679, St. Augustine. *Effects of the fall:* see the same authors and I, 152, St. Irenaeus; 428, St. Greg, of Nyssa. Concupiscence, I, 633, 679, 702, St. Augustine; II, 445, Hugh of St. Victor. See *Capital vices,* η. 121. Origin of evil, II, 401, St. Anselm. Anti-Christian natural optimism, II, 713-714. Augustinian supernatural optimism, I, 664; II, 863. S

71. Grace. —Reparation, see *Redemption,* n. 63. —The Holy Ghost in man : teaching of St. Irenaeus, I, 152 — (Divine Person and created gift; grace; perfect gifts). See also St. Augustine : *De spiritu et littera,* 630; the gifts, 687. Cassian 600. Cappadocians, 437, 443, 445. The Holy Ghost deifies, II, 37-38, St. Cyril of Alex.; Lombard's error on the Holy Ghost and charity. Doctrine of Justification defined, II, 726 (Council of Trent.). *General theological synthesis on grace, (xyj-bv],* St. Thomas; necessity, 607; essence 608; effects, 610; various habitus, 611; mystical graces, 612-617.

72. Sanctifying Grace. — *a) Sin* but not concupiscence *is destroyed,* 680, St. Augustine. See *Redemption,* n. 63, *Fallen man,* n. 70, *Baptism,* n. 80. — *b) Spiritual rebirth :* work of the Holy Ghost, 152, St. Irenaeus; image of God restored, 680, St. Augustine. — *c) Divine lije in the soul:* I, 152, St. Irenaeus; 352, St. Athanasius; 443, Cappadocians; 508, Mark the Hermit; and chiefly St. Augustine, 680. — *d) Presence of Godin the soul :* the Christian is a God-bearer, 71, St. Ignatius; a temple of God, 406, Didymus; 544, St. Ambrose. See *Names and Functions of Christ,* n. 65. — *e) Divinisation,* II, St. Cyril, 37-39; St. Maximus, 312; St. Bonaventure, 519; St. Thomas, 609-612; Duns Scotus, 659; Infused habitus, 602, St. Thomas; 659 Duns Scotus; see *Gifts of the Holy Ghost,* n. 74. Knowledge of the state of grace, II, 743, Catharinus. Grace and the love of God, II, 847, St. Francis of Sales.

73. Actual grace. — *a) Necessity :* St. Irenaeus, 152; Origen, 214; St. Cyprian, 268; S. Ephraem, 383; St. Greg. Naz., 343; St. J. Chrysost., 489; St. Ambrose, 544; S. Jerome, 578; Cassian, 508 sq.; and chiefly St. Augustine, 629 sq. and 682. See *Pelagianism,* n. 44. — *b) Gratuity:* Semipelagian teaching, I, 601-603 (Cassian), 11, 162 (Lerins). Defenders of gratuity, I, 635-637 and 682 (St. Augustine); II, 176 (Augustinians), 187-190 (St. Prosper), 196-199) (St. Fulgentius). Definition of the teaching, 203-207 (Orange). — *c) Nature of actual grace:* see especially St. Greg. Naz., I, 443; St. J. Chrys., 489; St. Augustine,

683-686; more powerful grace than Adam's 683; operating and co-operating, 684; not prejudicial to free·will, 685; extremely efficacious. 685. Heavenly delectation, 685. — *d) Theological synthesis,* 11, 593. Various schools : Franciscan, 11, 659; Duns Scotus; Ockham, 666; Dominican, 742 sq., various; 748, Bannez, etc.; Augustinian, 762 Noris; Jesuit, 770, 787 congruism; 771, 777 Molinism; 849 St. Francis of Sales. — *c)* Congruism: intrinsic, 1, 684; St. Augustine, II, 75I*755› various 17th cent. Thomists; extrinsic, II, 770, Bellarmine; 786, Suarez; — *f)* Molinism : beginnings, II, 765 Jesuits; 766 Molina; Explanation : definition of liberty, 772; divine notion, 773; praedestination, 773: scientia media, 774. application, 775. *De Auxiliis* Controversies, 776.

74. Gifts of the Holy Ghost. — Early data, I, 151 St. Irenaeus; 599 Cassian; 697 St. Augustine; II, 246 St. Greg, the Great; 444 Hugh of St. Victor; 519 St. Bonaventure. See *Superior Graces,* n. 75. Theological synthesis, II, 611, (St. Thomas). The gift of understanding, 613, wisdom, 614; perfect knowledge of God deriving therefrom, 615; see *Contemplation,* n. 76; the beatitudes or perfect acts of virtue, 616; the fruits of the Holy Ghost, other perfect acts, 620. Other syntheses, 519, St. Bonaventure; 659 (Duns Scotus). The gifts and the mystical life, see *Mystical theology,* n. 78.

75. Superior graces. — Teaching of early writers on *the perfect gijts;* I, 152, St. Irenaeus; 599, Cassian; 686, St. Augustine; II, 108 St. Diadochus. Superior effects of grace: peace, I, 512 monks; 544, St Ambrose; 600, Cassian; II, 312 St. Maximus; spiritual joys, I, 685, 688, St. Augustine; perfect liberty 685, 688, St. Augustine; wisdom, 152, St. Irenaeus; 216, Origen; 406, Didymus; 686, St. Augustine; perfect prayer, I, 599, Cassian; 686-688, St. Augustine; perfect charity, I, 186, Clement of Alex.; II, 287 St. John Climacus, 313 St. Maximus; perfect knowledge of Christ: I, St. Ignatius 73; St. Irenaeus, 152; Clement, 187; Origen, 203; St. Athanasius, 353; Didymus, 406; St. Augustine, 687. II, 312 St. Maximus. On the Alexandrian gnosis: I, 186, Clem, of Alex., and 203, Origen. See *Contemplation,* n. 76.

76. Contemplation. Definition, 1, 20-27 (general Introduction). See *Mystical Theology,* n. 78. Early data, see *Superior graces,* n. 75. Various descriptions: II, 94-98 Dionysius the Areopagite, 107-110 St. Diadochus; 248-251 St. Greg, the Great; 438 St. Bernard; Hugh of St. Victor; 448-450 Richard of St. Victor; 452-456 St. Bonaventure; 694-711 various authors in each school; 817-824 St. Teresa; 830-832 St. John of the Cross; 856-860 St. Francis of Sales; Theological studies, in addition to last mentioned authors, see II, 612-617 S. Thomas; 709-711 Gerson; 788 Suarez; Active form of contemplation, I, 26-28, definition; II, 362 foundations; 448-450, 453-456 and 698-700 Augustinians of St. Victor; 522-526 St. Bonaventure; 615 St. 'Thomas; 694 sq., various authors; 812 St. Teresa; 830 St. John of the Cross; 856 St. Francis of Sales. Principles: see *Gifts of the Holy Ghost,* n. 74 and *Mystical Theology,* n. 78.

77. Extraordinary Graces. — Charismata, I, 45-48, Didache; 373, Apostolic Constitutions; 688, St. Augustine. Montanist errors, I, 101, and 239 Tertullian. Extraordinary favours (visions, etc.), 1,688, St. Augustine; II. 455 Richard of St. Victor; 520 S. Bonaventure; 616 St. Tho-

mas; 697, 700, 702, 704, (divers revelations); 705 Dionysians in 14th. cent.; 819 St. Teresa.

78. Mystical Theology. — *a)* Mystical theology means: a) Passive contemplation or essentially infused knowledge of God, II, 96 Dionys. the Areopagite; b) Active contemplation or contemplative theology, II, 452-454 Richard of St. Victor; 507 and 522 sq. St. Bonaventure; c) Theology of the mystical graces, II, 709 Gerson. This latter is the modern technical meaning of "mystical theology"; object, II, 360 ordinary and extraordinary. See *Superior Graces,r\.* 75, *Contemplation,* n. 76 and *Extraordinary Graces,* n. 77. Classical masters, all the authors mentioned nos, 75-77. — ¿) Chief authors of speculative mystical syntheses, II, 446-454 and 697-699 Victorines; 612-616 St. Thomas; practical mysticism, II, 438 St. Bernard; 816-823 St. Teresa; 827-840 St. John of the Cross; 855-858 St. Francis of Sales. — *c) Meaning of the word* "mystical" according to the majority of writers: II, 359 basic meaning; 359 derived meanings; 360, 361 and 866, false and ambiguous meanings; 341 mysticism. See *Religiosity,* n 17. —*d Necessity* of the mystical graces, II, 341, (2 schools); 364 early opinions Characteristics of early schools, II, 691 principles; 691-711 classifications; 863, 865 new schools. Allowable divergence of viewpoint, 364-366 general outline. — *¿) Diverse tendencies,* II, 361 sq., 691, mysticism and asceticism; see *Ascetic theology,* n. 116. Mysticism and Moralism ; 1,662 St. Augustine; II, 844 and 856 S. Francis of Sales. Mysticism and Humanism, II, 791 oppositions; 855 agreement in St. Francis of Sales.

E) SACRAMENTS.

79. The Sacraments in general. — *a) The word,* 1, 248, Tertullian; 266, St. Cyprian; 707, St. Augustine. — *b) General data (early)* : I, 248. Tertullian; 266, St. Cyprian; 377 Aphraates; 384, St. Ephraem; 489, St. John Chrysostom; 546, St. Ambrose; 577, St. Jerome; 609, St. Optatus; 627 and 707-708, St. Augustine, *c) In the Middle Ages:* influence of canonical collections II, 389, 467 and 468, Gratian. First attempts at synthesis: Hugh of St. Victor, 443; the " Summa Sententiarum 461 ; Peter Lombard gives the list of seven sacraments, 459. Developments due to commentaries of the *Sententiae;* Alexander of Hales, 493; St. Bonaventure, 519; St. Thomas, 545. *d) Thomist synthesis,* 628: causality, 627; matter and form, 627; reasons for the number of seven, 628. Other theories on causality: St. Bonaventure. 518; Melchior Cano, 628, 747; Duns Scotus, 660; Suarez, 787. — *e) lAirious questions :* intentions; theory of Catharinus, 744. — Sanctifying influence of the rites, too, Dionysius the Areopagite. The sacraments and Christian life, 852 St. Francis of Sales.

80. Baptism. — See the *Didache,* I, 45, 59-51; S. Ignatius, 67, 71; St. Justin, 128; Hermas, 84; St. Irenaeus, 150; Clem. Alex., 191; Origen, 215; Tertullian, 241-242; S. Cyprian, 260(the controversy), 261 (teaching); St. Dionysius, 276; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 368; Aphraates, 377; St. Basil, 407; St. Greg.Nyssa, 429 and the Cappadocians, 443: Chrysostom, 490: St. Optatus, 609, St. Augustine, 627, 708.— *Baptism ofheretics:* St. Cyprian's error, I, 260. Traditional leaching, 267. Donatisi error, 390; refutation by St. Optatus, 609 and St. Augustine, 624, 708 (validity and efficacity). Nature of the sacramental rite. II, 264, St. Isidore. Substitute

for Baptism (Cajetan's opinion), il, 742. — Christian initiation by three sacraments; I, 128, St. Justin; 241, Tertullian; 267, St. Cyprian; 377, Aphraates; 521; St. Ambrose; II, according to St. Augustine, Baptism is a sanctifying rather than an initiating rite, 708. Rites, 100, Dionysius the Areopagite; 135 St. Leo; 264 St. Isidore.

81.Confirmation. — Sacrament of Initiation, see *Baptism* above. Early data, I, 191, Clem. Alex.; 248, Tertullian; 266, St. Cyprian; 368, St. Cyril of Jerusalem; Aphraates, 377; St. John Chrysostom, 490; St. Augustine, 710; II, 100 Dionysius the Areopagite; 340, St. John Damascene. Later theology, see *Sacraments,* n. 79.

82. Holy Eucharist. — See *I)iliache,* 1, 45, 49-51 ; St. Ignatius, 67-71; St. Justin, 120; St. Irenaeus, 150: Abercius, 154; Pectorius, 154; Clem. Alex., 191; Origen, 215; Tertullian, 248; St. Cyprian, 266; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 368; Aphraates, 377; Cappadocians, 443; Chrysostom, 400; S. Ambrose, 546; St. Augustine, 709-710. Eucharistic teaching refutes Nestorianism, II, 40, St. Cyril; and Monophysitism, 136 St. Leo. On Eucharistic diphysitism, see 11, 45 Theodoret. Traditional teaching of St. John Damascene, 340. *First scholastic controversies,* II, 382 Paschasius Radbertus, Ratramnus. Berengarius' errors, 388. Systems 630 St. Thomas; 786 Suarez. Communion and Christian life, II, 40, St. Cyril; 708, *Imitation of Jesus Christ;* 853 St. Francis of Sales.

83. Penance. — *a) Primitive data* of the Didache, 45, 46, 49; and St. Clement, 59. General data on penance in the 2nd cent., 88-90. Teaching of Hermas : unity, necessity, efficacity, universality of penance, 90; how it is practised, 93. — *b}* In the 3rd cent. Origen's teaching, 215; Hippolytus, 227-229; and especially Tertullian, 242-245; the *De poenitentia,* 242; the *De pudicitia,* 243; importance of the edict of Callistus, 244-245. See also Clem. Alex., 180, 191 ; Novatian 252; St. Cyprian, 257, 267; St. Greg. Thaum., 284: — *c) In the 4th cent.,* St. Basil, 415; Chrysostom, 490; St. Ambrose, 533, 546. St. Pacianus, 606; St. Augustine, 711. See *Novatianism.— d) From the gth io the 8th cent,* General outline, II, 136; concerning St. Leo: confession, 136; expiation. 137; absolution, 138. St. Gregory's attitude, 244. Dionysius the Areopagite, 101. The *penitentials* in the West, II 276; in the East, 280. Practical treatises on penance, II, 640. See *Treatises on Moral Theology,* n. 104. Particular opinions of Duns Scotus, 660 and Suarez, 780.

84.Extreme Unction. — Early witnesses; the Euchologion Serapionis, I, 371, Aphraates, 377 and St. Innocent, 515. To be distinguished from the anointing of the dead mentioned by Dionysius the Areopagite, il, 101. In the Middle Ages, Hugh of St. Victor, 444 etc. See *Sacraments,* n. 79.

85.Holy Orders. —The priesthood in general, 1, 55-57, St. Clement of Rome; 238, Tertullian; 252-256, Aphraates; 515, St. Innocent; 709 St. Augustine. The (metaphorical) priesthood of every Christian according to Clem. Alex., 188; Tertullian, 247. — *Ordination:* Hippolytus, I, 225; Apostolic Constitutions, 225; Octateuch, 374; Euchologion Serapionis, 370; St. Leo, II, 139; Dionysius the Areopagite 100. Irregularities, I, 515; St. innocent. II, 139 St. Leo. Greatness of the priesthood, St Chrysostom, I, 474· See *Dignity oj the Priesthood,* n. 131. Degrees, see *Hierarchy,* n. 88 Tonsure, 11, 264.

86. Marriage. — Episcopal approbation required, I, 67, St. Ignatius. Conjugal fidelity according to Hennas, 94. Unity of marriage according to Tertullian, 241. *Second marriages* discouraged in the East 132, Athenagoras; 444, St. Greg. Naz.; 476, St. Basil; 476 and 492, St. J. Chrysostom. *Divorce* on account of adultery 444, St. Basil; 492, St. John Chrysostom; 652, St. Augustine. *Lawfulness of* marriage : Montanist and Encratite errors, 106; teaching of Clem. Alex., 183; St. J. Chrysostom, 487; St. Ambrose, 532; St. Jerome, 557; and St. Augustine, 634, 652, and 710. *Essence* of the sacrament, II, 630. Melchior Cano's opinion, 746.

F) THE CHURCH.

87. The Churoh (in general). — Mystical marks: the Church is the Body of Christ, I, 704, St. Augustine ; II, 630 St. Thomas. The Church is "*Charity*", 69, St. Ignatius. *Christ* is present in the Church, 69 St. Ignatius, and also the *Spirit of God,* 147, St. Irenaeus. The Church is a *mother,* 263; a promise of eternal life, 538, St. Ambrose. See especially St. Augustine, I, 703; St. Thomas, II, 630. Main mystical tendencies of medieval defenders of the Pope, II, 681. Organic and social viewpoint. II, 340 (St. John Damascene).

88. Ecclesiastical hierarchy. — *a) A true hierarchy* distinct from the charismatic gifts, I, 47-48, Didache; 57-58, St. Clement; 66-68, St. Ignatius; see also, 96, Hermas; 189, Clem. Alex.; 204, Origen. Tertullian's Montanist error, 249. — *b)* Hierarchy in *three degrees:* 57-59, St. Clement; monarchical episcopate : 66-67, St. Ignatius; 11, 137 St. Leo. Difficulties in St. Jerome, 589-590; and in Ambrosiaster, 605. — *c) Lower degrees of* the hierarchy, I, 287, Didascalia; and 373, Apostolic Constitutions. The laity, 57, 67, St. Clement; II, 254 St. Isidore. — *d) Sanctifying function of* the hierarchy, II, 100 Dionys. the Areopagite, see *Holy Orders,* n. 85. Duties of the Clergy, see *Pastoral action,* n. 132.

89.The teaching Church, see the *Magisterium of the Church,* n. 30; the *Holy See,* n. 31, and the *Roman Church,* n. 95, etc.; *Bishops, Councils* etc., n. 32 sq.

90.The Churoh, dispenser of Grace. — *a)* The Church is the steward of the *means of sanctification,* I, 35. the Apostolic Fathers; 384, St. Ephraem; see the mystical marks of the Church, n. 87. — *b)* She has the keeping *of* the *sacraments,* 67, St. Ignatius. St. Cyprian's exaggeration, 265; corrected by St. Optatus, 609, and St. Augustine 627 and 709. — *c) Power regarding sacrament* of penance, 86, 87, 93, Hermas; 215, Origen. Errors: see *Penance,* n. 83. St. Cyprian's true teaching, 265; St. Ambrose, 546; St. Pacianus, 606; St. Augustine, 710.

91. Holiness, a mark of the Churoh. — The Chinch is holy as *dispenser of grace* (see n. 90); by her reforming moral power, see *Christian Austerity,* n. 114; — by her mission as *guardian of morality,* 537, St. Ambrose, — see *The Church and the State,* n. 98. — In addition, the Church is a *society of saints,* 87, Hermas (Sim. 3 and 4) but of *relative holiness* in this world, 90, Hermas, 90. Donatisi error, 390. Refuted by St. Optatus, 608, and St. Augustine, 626 and 704.

92. Catholicity of the Churoh. — The Catholic Church in St. Ignatius, 68; St. Cyprian, 263; St. Chrysostom, 493; St. Pacianus, 606; St. Optatus, 609; and chiefly St. Augustine, 626 (writings against Donatisi») and also 704. See Unity, n. 93.

93. Unity of the Church. — Unity in general shewn by "charity", 68-69, St. Ignatius; 96, Hernias. *Doctrinal* unity, 127, St. Justin; 147-148, St. Irenaeus; 236, Tertullian; see all the controversialists, especially St. Augustine, 627, 704, 710. *Social,* hierarchical and sacerdotal unity, 263, St. Cyprian; 493, Chrysostom; 538, St. Ambrose; 627, 704, St. Augustine. *St. Leo,* defender of unity, II, 126 sq.; in the West, 126; in the East, 128; his teaching on the conditions of unity, 13S and the nature of the pontifical power, 140. See *Doman Church,* n. 95. — *Great crises* of Unity, eastern schism, 386 and 689; Great Schism *of* the West, 685-688.

94. Apostolicity of the Church. — Apostolicity of the hierarchy and of teaching, 140, Hegesippus; 147-148, St. Irenaeus; 236, Tertullian *(prescription);* 259, St. Cyprian. Apostolicity finally based on the Apostolic See, 304, or on tie Roman Church, which is the Church of Peter. See n. 95.

95. The Apostolic See or the Roman Church. — *a)* Fundamental witnesses TO its authority : St. Clement : Peter and Paul at Rome; implicit manifestations of authority, 60; St. Ignatius : *praesidens·caritate,* 68-69; Hermas, 96; Hegesippus: apostolicity, 140; St. Irenaeus: apostolicity, unity and preeminence, 147-148; St. Victor causes councils to be held, 143, 153; St. Dionysius of Corinth, 153; Abercius : sovereignty, 154; Origen : antiquity, 193; Tertullian : *Pontifex Maximus,* 228; St. Cyprian : Chair of Peter, centre of unity, 259; primacy, 264 (St. Cyprian's error); St. Dionysius of Alex., and St. Dionysius of Rome : teaching authority, 277; anonymous *(De aleatoribus) :* vicar of the Lord, 288. — *b)* Lawful progress: 304. */Is causes:* I. general causes, 292, 302; 2. heresies, 295; 3. dangers which threaten unity of the Church arising from social and political environment, 293; from the division of the Empire, 294; from the creation of the patriarchates, 305. See *Patriarchates,* n. 97. — *c)* Historical facts confirming authority: general outline, 306. *Appeals to Rome:* St. Athanasius, 338-339; Council of Sardica, 339; Chrysostom, 470, 493, 517; Antoninus of Fussala, 519; Apiarius, 519. Theodoret, II, 47; Flavian of Constantinople, 56; Theodore *of* Studium, 342; *Doctrinal action:* condemnations of Apollinarius, 441, 450; Origen, 516, 575; Pelagius, 393, 518, .519, 631, 632; Nestorius, II, 27; Eutyches, 54. Guidance and confirmation of conciliary assemblies. See *Councils,* n. 33, and *Popes,* n. 96. Question of the *Schism of Antioch,* I, 514; 410, 418, 424, 441; 465; 538. — *d)* Doctrinal affirmations on the authority of the Roman Church : general outline, I, 308; Aphraates, 377; St. Ephraem, 384; St. Epiphanius, 399; Didymus, 440; St. Basil, 440; St. Greg. Ñaz., 440; Chrysost., 493; St. Ambrose, 538; St. Jerome, 588; St. Augustine, 631, 705. St. Leo, II, 57 sq., 139; St. Gelasius, 144; St. Symmachus, 147; Hormisdas, 62 and 148; St. Ennodius, 158; St. Greg, the Great, 238; St. Maximus, 307; St. Theodore of Studium, 347. — *e)* AUTHORITY OF THE POPE. Greater than that of the patriarchs, I, 305 sq.; II, 149. See *Patriarchates,* n. 97; greater even than that of oecumenical councils.·

See *Councils,* η. 33· The so-called conciliary theories, II, 686 and 687 (Gerson). Decree of Florence, II, 690. Theory of power *of* State, I, 293 (Caesaro-papism); II, 287 sq. (14th cent). See *Church and State,* n. 98.

96. The Popes : — *a) Pastoral action :* I, St. Clement, 59-60. St. Victor, 153; St. Callistus, 226; St. Jules, I, 339; St. Damasus, 513. St. Siricius. Decretals, 514; St. Innocent I, 516 etc. St. Leo, 11, 127. St. Gclasius, 146; St. Greg, the Great, 238. See *Appeals,* n. 95. — *b) Doctrinal Action:* foremost early popes: St. Dionysius, I, 277. St. Damasus, 513; St. Innocent and Zosimus,519, 632; St. Celestine, II, 28, 32; St. Leo, 55, 128. Doctrinal action of the councils, see *Councils,* n. 33. Roman authority, see *Apostolic See,* n. 95. Some objections; the affair of Liberius, I, 333; Vigilius and Pelagius, 11, 149; Honorius, 300. —*c) In the Middle Ages,* Alexander III, 468; Innocent III, and 13th cent., popes, 482; Boniface vili, 676. See *Church and State,* n. 98.

97.Patriarchates and Vicariates. — Ecclesiastical origin : three patriarchates in the 4th cent., I, 305, the creation of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, II, 298, 405; the ambition of the patriarchs, II, 62 (Acacius), etc.); submission to Hormisdas, 148 sq., attitude of the Emperor Justinian, 81; John iv the Faster, 237. Great patriarchs defenders of the images, 320. Schism prepared by Photius, 378; schism carried out by Michael Caerularius, 386. *Vicariates* of Thessalonica, I, 518; II, 128; of Arles, II, 127 and 164.

98. Church and State. — *a) General outline:* advantages and disadvantages of their union, I, 293. *Independence of the Church :* St. Athanasius' attitude, 341; St. Basil, 409, 440; St. J. Chrysostom, 467-468; St. Ambrose 523-527, 528, 536-537; St. Augustine 628, 706. *The Church as keeper of the moral law :* Chrysostom, 467-469; St. Ambrose 537. Church has *right to State protection :* St. Ambrose, 537; St. Augustine, 629, 706. — *b') Relations of the two societies:* St. Ambrose, 537, St. Augustine, 706; St. Gelasius, II, 144. Byzantine theory: II, 4-5, 80 and 85 (Justinian). *In the Middle Ages:* general outline, II, 676; Silvester, 391; Gregory VII, 676; Hugh of St. Victor, 444; St. Thomas, 631; Innocent iv, 677; Boniface, Vili, 677. Theories concerning royal and imperial power: II, 679. Defenders of the *rights of the pápe* in temporal affairs, 681 sq. : Giles of Rome, 682; James of Viterbo, 683; Augustinus Triumphus, 683; various authors, 684; various exaggerations, 685.

G) THE LAST THINGS.

99.The End of the World. — *Proximity of* the end of the world or the Parousia, according to the Didache, 46, 51; Hermas, 88; Montanus, 106; Tertullian 249. See also Lactantius *{Institutions,* bk. vil), 272 and chiefly St. Augustine, *{City of God,* bks. xix-xxn), 650, 711. On Anti-Christ, Hippolytus, 222; Commodian, 269; Lactantius, 272. The resurrection of thè body'': St. Justin, 119; Athenagoras, 132; Hippolytus, 232; Tertullian, 238; *De recta in Deum fide,* 287. Origen's teaching, 213, and against him, St. Peter of Alex., 279: St. Methodius, 285. The teaching of St. Greg, of Nyssa, 428; and Rutinus, 566. The supposed reign of a thousand years; see *Millenarianism.* The

Judgment: see the *Apocalypse of Peter,* 165; St. Ephraem, 384; St. Augustine, 712. Syrian teaching of the sleep of the soul, 377 (Aphraates).

100. Heaven, a) *Various Patristic data.* Faith and aspiration of St. Ignatius in the possession of Christ through death, 71, 72. Delay of the Beatific Vision according to St. Irenaeus, 153, and St. Ambrose, 547, against the Cappadocians, 447. *Apocalypse ofPeter,* 165. Origen's teaching, 213. The parts of heaven, 384 (St. Ephraem). Description of heaven 555 (Prudentius); 713 (St. Augustine). Heaven, vision of God, 712 (St. Augustine). — *d) Beatitude:* St. Thomas, II, 632; evolution of his ideas, 632. Duns Scotus' opinion, 660. Opinion of John XXII concerning delay of the beatific vision, 671.

101. Hell. — λ) *Eternity of hell:* Origen's error, 213; orthodox teaching of Origen's adversaries, Aphraates, 337; St. Ephraem, 384; St. Basil 447 (against St. Greg. Nyssa); St. Cyril of Jer., St. Chrysostom, 447. St. Ambrose's error, 547; Rufinus 566; St. Jerome, 591. St. Augustine's sounder teaching, 712. *b} Mitigation of* torments, 447, 712. f) *Description of* hell, Apocalypse of Peter, 163, and Prudentius, 555. *d) Children who die unbaptised:* St. Greg, the Great's opinion. Reason for this attitude, II, 198. Teaching om Limbo developed by St. Thomas, II, 199. A belated upholder of the early teaching, II, 673 (Gregory of Rimini).

102. Purgatory. — Prayers for the dead, 155 (Pectorius); St. Augustine (Confessions, IX, and *De cura,* 653, 712. See the History *of* Joseph, 162; St. Irenaeus' teaching, 153; St. Ambrose, 547. St. Augustine's teaching, 712. Same teaching in St. Isidore, II, 265.

III. DATA CONCERNING THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

A) MORAL THEOLOGY.

103. Christian moral teaching in general. — Definition 1, 19 (distinction from Dogma), 595-698 (St. Augustine). Christian morality and philosophical morality, 179 (St. Clement. Alex.), 544 (St. Ambrose); II, 605 sq. (St. Thomas). — Characteristics of Patristic moral teaching; Apostolic Fathers, I, 33, 36. Orthodox Encratism in the 2nd cent., 107; see 94 (Hennas), same tendency in Tertullian, 239-240, and in some measure in St. Cyprian, 268. Different tendency in Clement of Alexandria, 179, 183, 185. Moral theology in 4th cent., Fathers, 302, 699. Moralism, see *Doctrinal Tendencies,* n. 7. Speculative and practical moral theology, see *Treatises,* n. 104.

104. Treatises on Moral Theology. — *First little codexes of Christian morality:* The Two Ways: way of life, way of death, I, 45; reproduced in Ep. of Barnabas, 79. See also St. Clement, 56, 60, and Hennas (the precepts), 87, and also Tertullian, 239 sq. The majority of moral writings deal with special subjects. *Early general treatises:* general outlines of Christian morality; Clement of Alex., 181-184 *{Trilogy);* St Basil. 412 *(Mora', a);* St. Ambrose, 531, 540 *(De Officiis Ministrorum);* St. Augustine, 623 *(De moribus),* and 650-654; II, 180-

183; (J- Pomarius), 240 (St. Greg, the Great), 265 (St. Isidore), 324 (Antiochus of St. Sabbas), 332 (St. John Damascene). — *After the Fathers.* Speculative treatises : II, 599 (St. Thomas), 789 (Suarez). Practical works, II, 276 (Penitentials); treatises : 638 (St. Raymond of Pennafort), 739 (St. Antoninus), 770, 862 (Jesuits; St. Alphonsusj.

105. **Bases of Morality.** — Objective basis : beatitude, I, 540 (St. Ambrose), 698 (St. Augustine); II, 217 (Boethius), 600 (St. Thomas). Subjective conditions of morality according to St. Thomas, II, 561, 600 (human acts), 561 (role of the passions), 562, 601 (virtues), 562, 603 (vices, principles of sin), 562, 605 (law and grace). — Thomist synthesis of duties, 563 (theological virtues), 564 (moral virtues), 566 (special states). See *Liberty,* η. 151, and *Grace,* n. 73. — Special points. *Law,* I, 700 (St. Augustine); duty, I, 532 (St. Ambrose). Systems concerning conscience, II, 771 (Probabilism).

106. **Sin.** — The Way of Death, I, 45 (Didache), 87, 92 (Hennas), 245 (Tertullian). See *Penance,* n. 83. Various distinctions : *crimina mortalia* and *culpae mortales,* I, 215 (Origen); *delicta graviora* et *leviora.* 546 (St. Ambrose) : *crimina* and *peccata,* 546 (Pacianus). Final distinction of *mortal* and *venial* sins, I, 699 (St. Augustine); II, 138 (St. Leo). 151 (St. Cesarius), 202 (St. Fulgentius), 244 (St. Greg, the Great), 265 (St. Isidore), 605 (St. Thomas). Capital sins, see *Vices,* η. 121.

107. **Virtue.** — Early *Classifications,* St. Clement, I, 56; Hennas, 88; Clement of Alex., 180; Prudentius, 554; II, Pomarius, 182; St. Caesarius, 202; St. John Climacus, 284; Hugh of St. Victor, 443; Final classifications: St. Augustine, I, 699; II, St. Bonaventure, 521: St. Thomas, 603. *Theological definition,* II, 601 parts; infused 601 (St. Thomas), 660 (Duns Scotus). Divisions, II, 601 (St. Thomas). — *Theological virtues,* I, 185 (Clement of Alex.), 268 (St. Cyprian), 699 (St. Augustine); II, 107 (St. Diadochus), 287 (St. John Climacus), 366, 865 (Bossuet), 601 and 620 (St. Thomas), 836 (St. John of the Cross). — *Cardinal virtues,* I, 498 (St. Isidore of Pelusium), 531 (St. Ambrose), 699 (St. Augustine); II, 234 (St. Martin), 264 (St. Isidore), 601 and 619 (St. Thomas). — Perfection: Fundamental role of charity, I, 700 (St. Augustine) : II, 620 sq., (St. Thomas). See *Charity,* n. 110 and the authors of *Spiritual Treatises,* η. 117. Various viewpoints, II, 362-364 sq. Perfection and *wisdom,* I, 216 (Origen), 405 (Didymus) 686 (St. Augustine). Perfection and *peace'.* I, 150 (St. Irenaeus), 186 (Clement of Alex, *apatheid)',* 216 (Origen): 405 (Didymus); 512 (monks); 543 (St. Ambrose); 597 (Cassian); 662 sq. ; 686 (St. Augustine). See *Contemplation,* n. 76. Perfection and perfect acts, II, 617 (St. Thomas). See *Active and Contemplative Life,* n. 129. Perfection and submission to the Holy Ghost, I, 154 (St. Irenaeus), 699 (St. Augustine); II, 613 sq. (St. Thomas); see *Gifts of the Holy Ghost,* n. 74.

108. **Faith.** — Brief theological synthesis, II, 593 (St. Thomas). Summary of the truths of faith, or the rule of faith, see *Creeds,* n. 29. Rational character of faith, see *Reason and Faith,* n. 19. Faith and the gnosis, I, 202 (Clement of Alex.), 202 (Origen), 360 (St. Hilary). Faith and Christian life, I, 360 (St. Hilary), 641 (St. Augustine). The witness of blood : martyrdom, the desire *of* martyrdom : St. Irenaeus, I, 65, 72. Witness of the word, 108 (Apologists), 116 (St. Justin). Exhortation

to Martyrdom, 200 (Origen), 239 (Tertullian, *Ad Martyres)}* 262, 268 (St. Cyprian, letters). Neither apostasy nor provocation : Clement of Al., 183; St. Cyprian, 257, 262. Tertullian's contrary attitude, 239 *(Scorpiace, De fuga}.* Dangers of apostasy 239 (Tertullian); various forms of apostasy 256.

109. Hope. Theological synthesis, 11, 664 (St. Thomas). Ardent confidence, 71-72 (St. Ignatius); Parousia, 61. True home of the Christian, 86 (Hermas), 112 (Epistle to Diognetus).

no. Charity. — Theological synthesis, II, 663 (St. Thomas).— *a} Love of God.* Fundamental duty, 1,45 (Didache) 56 (St. Clement) 71 (St. Ignatius); Clement of Alex., 186; see especially St. Augustine, 662, 698, 700; II, 43 (Theodoret), 124 (St. Leo), 438 (St. Bernard; 846 (St. Francis of Sales). *Union with God by Charity*, I, 187 (Clement of Alex.), 216 (Origen), 597 (Cassian, 668, 697 (St. Augustine); II, 810 (St. Teresa), 846 sq. (St. Francis of Sales). *Union with Christ:* I, 71 (St. Ignatius); 300 (Origen); 410 (Didymus); 543 (St. Ambrose); 668, 697 (St. Augustine); II, 438 (St. Bernard); 525 (St. Bonaventure); 822 (St. Teresa). See *Foundations of the Spiritual Life,* η. 118 and *Perfection,* n. 107.— Love of our neighbour. Obligations of Christian charity, I, 45, 46 (Didache); 55 (St. Clement) 79 (ll Clem.); 87 (Hennas). Through their charity, Christians become "imitators *of* God", 114 *(Ep. to Diog.),* 133 (Athenagoras). Exhortations to almsgiving, St. Cyprian, I, 260; to flee envy, 262, 268; St. Basil, 397. Love of the poor; St. Greg. Naz. 422; St. Chrysost., 479, 487; St. Ambrose, 521, 542; St. Augustine, 622, 702 (works of mercy); II, 251 (St. Greg, the Great).

in. Prudence.—Theological synthesis, H, 564 (St. Thomas). *Wisdom,* I, 179-184 (Clement of Alex.), 216 (Origen), 400 (Didymus), 540 (St. Ambrose), 697 (St. Augustine); II, 183 (Pomarius). See *Perfection,* n. 107. Christian life conceived as a philosophy, I, 112 (St. Justin), 185 (Clement of Alex.), 486 and 488 (St. J. Chrysost.). Discernment of spirits, II, 708 and 710 (Gerson), 796 (St. Ignatius).

112. Justice. — Theological synthesis, II, 564 (St. Thomas). First moral codexes, 1, 45 (Didache), 60 (St. Clement on necessary order). Justice and Charity, I, 487 (St. J. Chrysostom): II, 182 (Pomarius). The Church, keeper of justice, I, 531 (St. Ambrose), 701 (St. Augustine). — Religion:!, 184 (Clement of Alexandria), II, 788 (Suarez), 864 (Bertille). See *Prayer and Devotion,* n. 123-124. Truth : chastity of the mind according to St. Augustine, 652. Augustinian teaching on lying, I, 635-636, 681; opposed to that of Clement of Alex, Origen, St. Hilary, Cassian, I, 596. Simplicity and veracity, I, 87 (Hernias). Various viewpoints, ll, 398 (St. Anselm), 434 (St. Bernard).

113. Fortitude. — Theological synthesis: II, 565 (St. Thomas) acts and connected virtues. The spirit of fortitude, see *Spiritual Combat,* n. 120. Martyrdom, see *Faith,* n. 108. *Patience,* virtue often counselled, I, 240, 232 (Tertullian), 257 (St. Cyprian) 264 (St. Dionysius of Alexandria), 477 (St. J. Chrysostom, letters), 598 (Cassian), 653 (St. Augustine). Providential role of suffering, I, 119 (St. Justin), 112 (Ep. to Diognetus), (St. J. Chrysostom).

114. Temperance. — Theological synthesis, II, 566 (St. Thomas) acts, connected virtues. Christian austerity. Encratism of fervent Christians, 1, 91. Hernias, see 107. Fasting : Hernias *(Sim.* 5), 87; Tertullian, 241. Monastic austerity, see the *Religious Spirit,* n. 128. Moral reform, see Hernias, 90 sq.; Origen, 200; St. Cyprian, 255-256. Christians are the soul of the world, 114. *Apologetic importance* of Christian life: Aristides, **ill;** St. Justin, 114; Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, 137. St. Augustine against Manichaeism, 622-623. *Modesty:* need of, Clement of Alex., 181-182; 246 (Tertullian). *Moderation* in the use of riches, Clement of Alex., 180; St. Methodius, 286; Chrysostom, 487.

115. Various States. — Theological synthesis, 11, 566 (St. Thomas). — State of *marriage: duties:* St. Augustine, 652 *(De bono conjugali).* See *Marriage,* n. 86. Sanctification of the family, St. Chrysostom, 487. — Virginity, Advice of Pseudo-Clement, I, 81; Origen, 192, 217; Tertullian 240; St. Cyprian, 257. St. Methodius' teaching, 286 *(The Banquet);* Basil of Ancyra, 318; St. Athanasius, 347; St. Greg. Nyssa, 429; Chrysostom, 476, 487; St. Ambrose, 532, 543; St. Jerome, 577, 592; Nicetas of R., 604; St. Augustine, 652. State of Perfection, see *Religious Life,* etc., n. 127 sq. — Clergy, see *Pastoral,* n. 131-136.

B) SPIRITUAL LIFE.

116. Ascetic Theology. — Asceticism, 11, 361 (Definition). Definition of Ascetic Theology, I, 19 (part of moral, theol.), 701 (teaching of St. Augustine); II, 598 and 617-621 (St. Thomas). Teachers of asceticism with a marked mystical tendency, I, 662, 701 (St. Augustine); II, 246-255 (St. Greg, the Great), 430-441 (St. Bernard), 690-693 (various medieval schools), 808-813 (St. Teresa), 833-837 (St. John of the Cross), 850 (St. Francis of Sales). Speculative synthesis, 607-621 (St. Thomas), 789 (Suarez). Practical ascetic method, II, 795-800 (St. Ignatius).

117. Spiritual Treatises. — Early monastic writings: Apophthegmata, I, 505 sq., and II, **in;** Spiritual letters, ll, no. Spiritual teachers, authors *of* treatises, 1, St. Basil, 412; St. Greg. Nyssa, 429; St. Chrysostom, 473, 486, 488; St. Isidore, 498; St. Ambrose, 543: St. Jerome, 593; Cassian, 597-601; St. Augustine, 703. II, Theodoret 44; Diadochus, 106; St. John Climacus, 284; various, 288; St. Maximus, 310; St. Bernard, 428; Hugh of St. Victor, 446; Richard of St. Victor, 450; St. Bonaventure, 505; various Schools, 694 sq.; Garcia de Cisneros, 791; St. Ignatius, *Exercises,* 795; Scupoli, 801; St. Teresa, 806 sq.; St. John of the Cross, 830 sq.; St. Francis of Sales, 842 sq. See also Erasmus, 724. For theologians, see *Ascetic Theology,* η. 116.

118. Foundations of the Spiritual Life. — Fundamental importance of the love of God, I, 648 and 700 (St. Augustine); II, 845 and 850 (St. Francis *of* Sales): see *Charity,* η. 119. Its natural bases, I, 700 (Image of God, St. Augustine); II, 435 (St. Bernard), 847 (St. Francis of Sales); supernatural bases, sanctifying grace, I, 700 (St. Augustine); I, 40 (St. Cyril), 435 (St. Bernard), 620 (St. Thomas), 847 (St. Francis of Sales). Growth by charity, see *Degrees of Perfection,* n. **it**9. On Christ, our Way, see in addition to *Names and Functions of Christ,* rr. 65, II, 312 (St. Maximus), 435 (St. Bernard), 812 (St. Teresa), 851

(St. Francis of Sales). Rôle of the Holy Ghost, see *Grace,* and *Gifts of the Holy Ghost,* n. 71 sq.; 74 sq.

119. Degrees of Perfection. — The three ways: I, 21-22 (Introduction), II, 95 (Dionys. the Areopagite), 313 (St. Maximus), 521 (St. Bonaventure), 620 (St. Thomas), 839 (St. John of the Cross), 842 (St. Francis of Sales). Other classifications : I, 429 (St. Greg. Nyssa), 597, 599 (Cassian), and chiefly St. Augustine, 701; II, 246 (St. Greg, the Great), 286 (St.John Climacus), 313 (St. Maximus), 433 sq. (St. Bernard), 450 sq. (Richard of St. Victor), 809 and 816 (St. Teresa) : see *Perfection,* n. 107.

120. The Spiritual Combat. — Tendency of the *Apostolic Fathers,* I, 36; see especially the llnd Ep. of Clement, 80; see also the Two Ways in the Didache, 45, and Ps.-Barnabas, 78, and Hermas, 94. Warlike 2nd cent, literature, 97. Epistle to Diognetus; the flesh and the spirit, 114. Christ (Tutor) is a general, 181 (Clement of Alex.). The struggle against the devil and the world : Peri-Archon, 199 (Origen). The Combat. *Monastic conception of* the spiritual life : 383 (St. Ephraem); 486 (St. J. Chrysostom); 508 (St. Nilus); 509 (Eastern monks); 593 (St. Jerome); 597 (Cassian); 703 (St. Augustine); poetical description, 556 (Prudentius); II, 286 (St. John Climacus); 346 (St. T leodore of Studium); 423, 434 (St. Bernard); 620 (St. Thomas); 795 (St. Ignatius); 801 (Scupoli). See *Religious Life,* n. 127 and *Schools of Spirituality,* n. 130. — The Devil: angel of temptation according to Hermas, I, 96; Origen (Peri-Archon), 199; St Athanasius (Life o‘ St. Anthony), 354; Eastern monks, 509; and 596 (Cassian). See also Chrysostom, 477. Discernment *of* spirits, II, 709, 711 (Gerson); 797 (St. Ignatius).

121. Capital Vices. — Various classifications: the way of death according to the Didache, I, 45; the 12 vices according to Hermas, 87, 92. Monastic classical division: *eight vices,* 510. See also, 383 (St. Ephraem); 507 (Evagrius); 508 (St. Nilus); 595, 597 (Cassian). St. Augustine and the triple concupiscence, 702 and self-love, 707; similarly, St. Maximus, II, 312; II, 246 (St. Greg, the Great); 265 (St. Isidore); 286 (St. John Climacus); 434 (St. Bernard); 605 (St. Thomas). See *Fallen man,* n. 70.

122. The Spiritual Weapons. —The most recommended weapons : prayer, I, 511; work, 511 : fasting, 511 : renunciation, penance, mortification, 598. St. Ambrose on *Virginity,* 453 (see η. 115). On the *study* of the Scriptures, see St. Jerome, 593; St. Augustine, 703; On the study *of* Theology, see 407 (St. Basil). — Penance, II, 244 (St. Greg, the Great); 277 (Penitentials); humility, II, 433 (St. Bernard); love, II, 435 (St. Bernard); 843 and 850 (St. Francis of Sales).

j23. Prayer. — The Christian is religious: answer to Pagan calumnies, 114 (Ep. to Diog.); 132 (Athenagoras); 234 (Tertullian), see *Apologists,* n. 35. — The primitive prayer: Didache 45 : Sunday assembly 49, 50; St. Clement, 57, 61. See *Rites,* n. 28. Treatises on prayer: Origen, 200, 217; Tertullian, 241; St. Cyprian, 257, 268; St. Greg. Nyssa, 429; St. Nilus 508. *Necessity ofprayer;* in addition to these treatises, see St. Irenaeus, 152; St. Ambrose, 543; St. Augustine, 703. See also 682. *Perfect prayer:* see Clem. Al., 185; Cassian, 599; St. Augustine, 662-664; 686-688. Prayer and study in the Augustinian method, 670.

Prayer for our neighbour is useful: Hermas *(Sim. of fho Elm),* 92. Prayer for the dead, see *Purgatory,* n. 102. Doctrine of prayer, II, 446 (Hugh of St. Victor); 450 sq. (Richard *of* St. Victor); 505 (St. Bonaventure); 565 (St. Thomas). See *Meditation,* n. 125. — Devotion, II, 125 (St. Leo) (spiritual childhood); 842 (St. Francis *of* Sales). See *Charity,* n. no.

124. Devotions. — *a)* Outstanding ¡narks of piety towards CHRIST: I, 700 (St. Augnstine); II, 312 (St. Maximus); 435 (St. Bernard); 812 (St. Teresa); 851 (St. Francis of Sales); 864 (various masters); See *Names and Functions of Christ,* n. 65. — *P)* Devotion towards Mary: foundations, divine maternity, Patristic synthesis, I, 678 (St. Augustine); II, 37 (St. Cyril); see *Mary,* n. 67. In the Middle Ages, II, 435 (St. Bernard); 519 (St. Bonaventure); 658 (Duns Scotus). Bl. Grignon de Montfort, II, 865.

125. Meditation. — Spirit of prayer, I, 185 (St. Clem, of Al.); soul of monachism, I, 515 (Monks); 599 (Cassian); 663, 686 and 644 (St. Augustine). — Early systematisations; consideration, II, 437 (St. Bernard); meditation and contemplation, 11,448, 696 (School of St. Victor); 522 sq. (St. Bonaventure). Planned *exercises,* II, 792 (Cisneros), 793 (Granada, Ossuna), 795 (St. Ignatius). Methods *g ì meditation,* II, 798 (St. Ignatius); 851, (St. Francis of Sales); 851 (St. Sulpice). Degrees ot Meditation, I, 26 (Synthesis). See *Contemplation,* n. 76.

126. Choral Office. — *In the IVest:* monastic origins, II, 208 (St. Caesarius) (St. Columba); 232 (St. Benedict); 242 (St. Gregory). — *In the East,* I, 412 (St. Basil); 515 (Monks); II, 290 sq., (various compositions). See *Pites,* n. 28. Liturgy and spirituality in the early Orders, II, 794 (Benedictines); 695 (Cistercians); 698 (Victorines); 700 (Dominicans), etc.; 800 (St. Ignatius' initiative); 852 (position of St. Francis of Sales).

127. Religious Life. — *Early forms.* Monachism in the East, I, general outline, I, 499-512; Anachoretic life, 502. Coenobitic life: Egyptian rules; Rule of St. Basil, 407, 312, II, 285 (St. John Climacus); 349 sq. (St. Theodore of Studium). In the West, Cassian, 595; St. Augustine, 621; II, 160 (Lerins); (S. Caesarius); 207 (St. Columba, etc.); 222 (Cassiodorus); 231 (St. Benedict). — *Later forms* which have had an important doctrinal influence: II, 422 and 693 (Benedictine and Cistercian reforms); 442 sq. and 696 (Canons Regular of St. Augustine at St. Victor); 485 sq. and 698 (Franciscans), 484 sq. and 700 (Dominicans); 705 sq. (other Canons Regular of St. Augustine); 708 (Carthusians); 763 sq. (Jesuits); 804 (Reformed Carmelites); 865 (various more recent foundations).

128. The monastic spirit. — Monastic doctrine: 1, 499 sq. (general outline); 383 (St. Ephraem); 353 (St. Athanasius); 412 (St. Basil); 429 (St. Greg. Nyssa); 473, 486, 488 (St. J. Chrysostom); 498 (St. Isidore); 543 (St. Ambrose); 593 (St. Jerome); 597-601 (Cassian); 703 (St. Augustine); II, 110 (Apophthegmata) (letters of spiritual direction); 112, 284 (hagiographers); 283 (Moschus); 284 (St. John Climachus) 344 (St. Theodore of Studium). *Characteristics of monastic life:* detachment, 474 (Chrysostom); 593 (St. Jerome); 598 (Cassian); 622 (St. Augustine). Love of solitude, 217 (Origen). See all the monastic writings. On life in community, see *Religious Life,* n. 127: IT, 208 (St. Caesarius); 232

(St. Benedict). Austerity, I, 511, 593 (St. Jerome); 598 (Cassian); 622 (St. Augustine), II, 208 (St. Columba). Work, I, 511, 303 (Euchite error); 407 (St. Basil); 593 (St. Jerome); 622, 703 (St. Augustine); II, 223 (Cassiodorus); 232 (St. Benedict). See *Prayer,* n. 123.

129. Active and Contemplative Life. — *General definition,* 1, 703, etc. (St. Augustine); II, 181 (J. Pomarius); 246 (St. Greg, the Great); 266 (St. Isidore); 522 (St. Bonaventure); 621 (Thomist synthesis). — *Perfect activity,* I, 543 (St. Ambrose); II, 250 (St. Gregory); 616 (perfect acts according to St. Thomas); 6(6 sq., (the perfect life); 823 (St. Teresa); 839 (St. John of the Cross); 858 (St. Francis of Sales).

130. Schools of Spirituality. — Characteristics, II, 691, 793 (secondary divergences). — Early Schools: ii, 695 (Benedictine); 696 (Cistercian); 697 (St. Victor); 698 and 793 (Franciscan); 700 and 793 (Dominican); 701 (Dionysian); 706 (Windesheim); 708 (Carthusian); 709 (Gerson); 673 and 794 (Hermits of St. Augustine). — Modern SCHOOLS : II, 794 (Ignatian); 803 (Carmelite); 840 (Salesian). Other new schools, 864. — Heterodox spiritual teachings, see *False Mysticism,* n. 47.

C) PASTORAL THEOLOGY. DISCIPLINE.

131. The Priesthood. — *Dignity of the Priest,* see St. Ephraem, I, 383; St. Greg. Naz., 422; Chrysostom, 475; St. Jerome, 586. — *Duties* of the priesthood in general; St. Ignatius, 67; Didascalia, 287; Chrysostom, 475; St. Ambrose, 541 *(De officiis);* St. Augustine, 659 (various letters). See *Pastoral activity,* n. 132.

132. Pastoral or priestly activity. — General outline according to St. Gregory the Great's *Pastoral,* II, 240 and 241 ; See also J. Pomarius, II, 180. *(De vita contemplativa).* On pastoral activity as fruit of contemplation, see St. Gregory, II, 250; St. Bernard 441; St. Thomas, 621. See also St. Teresa 823. Various forms of pastoral activity : defense of the faith, see *Controversy,* n. 40; doctrinal explanation of the truth, see *Doctrinal treatises,* n. 6; instruction of the laity, see *Preaching,* n. 133; direction of souls, see *Spiritual Direction,* n. 134. Great examples among the *Popes,* St. Leo, II, 121 sq.; St. Gregory, 234 sq.; *Bishops,* St. Basil, I, 406 sq.; St. John Chrysostom, I, 461 sq.; St. Cyril of Alexandria II, 20 sq.; St. Ambrose, I, 520 sq.; St. Augustine, I, 614 sq.; St. Francis of Sales, II, 843 sq.; *Priests,* St. Bernard, II, 421 sq.; St. Canisius, 733 sq.; etc.

133. Preaching. — Qualities required in those who speak of God, I, 421 (St. Greg. Naz.). Rules of *Christian Eloquence* according to Chrysostom, 475, and St. Augustine, 653, 658; St. Greg, the Great, II, 252; St. Francis of Sales, 842. Great *moaels :* St. Basil, I, 411; St. Greg. Naz., 421; St. Greg. Nyssa, 43°; Chrysostom, 481-483; St. Ambrose, 522; St. Augustine, 657-659; II, St. Leo the Great, 123; St. Peter Chrysologus, and St. Maximus 154; St. Bernard, 425. Other great preachers: St. Cyril of Alex., 11, 26; St. Caesarius 99; Ven. Bede, 255. Byzantines, 314 sq., St. Germanus, 321 sq.; St. John Damascene, 333; St. Bonaventure, 500; St. Francis of Sales, 842.

134. **Spiritual Direction.** — General direction, see Spiritual *Treatises,* η. 117. Individual direction, written, by correspondence see especially the *Letters of* St. Jerome, I, 586 sq.; St. Augustine, 659; St. Bernard, II, 429; St. Francis of Sales, 843.

135. **Disciplinary works.** — Chief early disciplinary works mentioned : *Didache,* 43 sq.; The *Apostolic Tradition,* 225; *Didascalia,* 287. various collections of *canons,* 372; *Apostolic Constitutions.* 373. Letters of the Eastern Fathers called *Canonical Epistles:* 279 (St. Peter of Alex.); 283 (St. Greg. Thaum.); 415 (St. Basil); 429 (St. Greg. Nyssa),

136. **Canonical legislation.** — It possesses doctrinal importance either because of its relation to theological sources, I. 462 (Yves de Chartres), or subjects shared with theology, i. e., sacraments, Church. II, 467 sq. — *Roman disciplinary action:* Decretals, I, 515 sq. See also *Popes,* n. 96 (pastoral activity); Dionysius the Less, II, 229; Gratian 467 (the Decree); Alexander III, 467; Gregory IX, 483. Other canonical works in the West, II, 202 and 203 (St. Caesarius); Fulgentius Ferrandus, 227; St. Marlin and St. Leander, 255; St. Isidore, 262, 264; Hincmar, 383. In the East in addition to the Canonical Epistles (see *Disciplina)y Works,* n. 135) see legislation of the synods of Antioch, I, 329 and of the Council in *Trullo,* II, 280; Nomocanons, II, 278 (John in) and 379 (Photius). Penitentials, II, 280 (John iv), and 304 (St. Sophronius). Monastic legislation, see *Religious Life,* n. 127.

IV. — ALPHABETICAL INDEX TO THE DOCTRINAL TABLE[1].

A

Activity, priestly and pastoral, n. 132.
Adoptionism, n. 42, c and 43, h.
Alogi, n. 43, c.
Angels, n. 51, a.
Anti-Christ, n. 99.
Antidicomarianites, n. 43, i.
Apollinarianism, n. 43, d.
Apologetics and Controversy, I, E, page 890.
Apologetics in the nirdcent.. n. 36.
Apologetics in the ivth cent., n. 37.
Apologetics (early) after the ivth cent., n. 38.
Apologetics against the Jews, n. 39.
Apologists, n. 35.

[1] lhe figures refer to the numbers of the preceding Doctrinal Index and not to the page, *unless otherwise stated.* The Doctrinal Index does not, obviously, indicate every existing text regarding each subject; the purpose of this work is not to form a collection of this kind. Nevertheless, the study of authors who, from various viewpoints, either as pioneers, or as creators of a later classical systematisation, have treated each point *ex professo,* has led us to provide, in the main fields of religious learning, varied elements that contain the essentials of a doctrinal history. In each group of this Index, though not perhaps in each section will l>e found series of parallel subjects, enabling the reader to trace the doctrinal development of important matters right from the beginning. Teachers will find here the matter for a course of lectures of a synthetic nature that may be usefully alternated with others of a more analytical character. A direct and practical study of any particular doctrinal work can thus be made easier, this general framework will afford a better grasp of the manifold aspects of the doctrine to be explained and shew its distant connection with other analogous works.

Apostolicity of the Church, η. 94.
Arianism, η. 42, d.
Aristotelism, n. io.
Arms (spiritual), η. I22.
Attributes (divine), η. 49.
Augustinianism, η. 9, c.
Augustinism, n. *g.*

B

Baptism, η. 8o.
Bishops, η. 32.
Bishops, η. 4·

C

Canon of the Scriptures, η. 21.
Catholicity of the Church, n. 92.
Charity, n. 110.
Christ, II. C, page 896.
Christ, n. 60.
Church, II, F. p. 903.
Church, guardian of grace, n. 90.
Church in general, n. 87.
Church (teaching), n. 89.
Church and State, n. 98.
Combat (Spiritual), n. 120.
Commentaries, n. 26.
Communication of characters, n. 60.
Councils, n. 33.
Conciliary theories, n. 45» f·
Confirmation, n. 81.
Congruism, n. 73, d.
Consubstantiality, n. 57·
Contemplation, n. 76.
Controversy, n. 46.
Creation, n. 50.
Creatures, n. 51.
Creeds, n. 29.

D

Definitions, I, A, p. 883.
Degrees of perfection, r>. 119.
Determinism, n. 44, c.
Devil, n. 119.
Devotions, n. 124.
Direction (spiritual), n. 134·
Disciplinary works, n. 135·
Docétism, n. 43, b.
Doctors, n. 1.
Doctrine, n. 1.
Dogma, n. 2.
Donatism, n. 45, c.

E

Encratism, n. 47, a.
End of the World, n. 99.
Errors (doctrinal), I, F, p. 891.
Eucharist, n. 82.
Exegesis. Biblical senses, n. 23.
Extreme Unction, n. 84.

F

Fathers, n. 34.
Faith n. 108.
Faith data (concerning), 11, page 893·
Foundations *of* morality, n. 105.
Foundations of the Spiritual Life. n. 118.
Fortitude, η. 113.
Fruits of the Redemption, n. 64.

G

Gnosticism, n. 41, a.
Gifts of the Holy Ghost, n. 74.
God, II, A, page 893.
Grace, n. 71.
Grace (actual), n. 73.
Grace (sanctifying), n. 72.
Grace (extraordinary), n. 77.
Graces (superior), n. 75.

H

Heaven, n. 100.
Hell, η. 101.
Hierarchy (ecclesiastical), n. 88.
History of Theology, n. 5.
Holy Ghost, n. 58.
Holy See, n. 31.
Homelies, n. 25.
Holiness, n. 91.
Hope, n. 109.
Humanism, n. 18.

I

Iconoclasm, n. 43, j.
Incarnation, n. 62.
Initiation (Christian), n. 80.
Introduction to Theology (General data for), I, p. 883 sq.

J

Jansenism, n. 44, e.
Judæo-Christianism, n. 43» a·
Judgment, n. 99.
Justice, n. 112.

K

Knowledge n. 14.
Knowledge of God, η. 48.
Knowledge of Christ, n. 66.

L

Last Things, n. 99.
Laxism, n. 47, c.
Legislation (canonical), n. 136.
Liberty, n. 15.
Life (active and contemplative), n. 129.
Life (Christian, data concerning), III, page 906.
Life (Religious), n. 127.
Limbo, η. 101, d.
Loci theologici, n. 40.
Luciferianism, n. 45 d.

M

Magisterium of the Church, n. 30.
Man, n. 51, b.
Man (fallen), n. 70.
Masters (spiritual), η. 117.
Manichaeism, n. 41, c.
Marcionism, n. 41, b.
Marriage, n. 86.
Mary, n. 67.
Martyrdom, n. 108.
Meditation, n. 125.
Millenarianism, n. 46, a.
Mithraism, n. 41, e.
Modalism, n. 42, b.
Molinism, n. 73, e.
Monothelitism, n. 43, g.
Monophysitism, n. 43, f.
Montanism, n. 47, b.
Moral theology, n. 3.
Morality (Christian, in general), n. 103.
Moralism, n. 7.
Mysticism, n. 7.
Mysticism (false), n. 47, d.

N

Natures of Christ, n. 61.
Neoplatonism, n. 41, e.
Nestorianism, n. 43, e.
Names and Functions of Christ, n. 65.
Novatianism, n. 45, b.

0

Office (choral), n. 126.
Orders (Holy), n. 85.
Origenism, n. 46, b.

P

Pantheism, n. 41, f.
Parousia, n 99.
Pastoral and Discipline, III, C, page 912.
Patriarchates and Vicariates, n. 97
Patripassianism, n. 42, b.
Pelagianism, n. 44, a.
Penance, n. 83.
Perfection, n. 107.
Person, n. 16.
Persons (the Three), n. 54.
Philosophy, I, B, page 885.
Photianism, n. 42, g.
Photinism, n. 42, e.
Platonism, n. 10.
Pneumatomachi, n. 42, e.
Popes, n. 96.
Predestinationism, n. 41, g.
Predestination, n. 53.
Prayer, n. 123.
Preaching, n. 133.
Priesthood, η. 131.
Priscillianism, n. 41, d.
Protestantism, n. 44, d.
Providence, n. 52.
Prudence, n. in.
Purgatory, n. 102.

Q

Quartodecimans, n. 45, a.

R

Reason and Faith, n. 19.
Redemption, n. 63.
Regalian teaching, n. 45, e.
Religion, n. 112.
Religiosity, n. 17.
Resurrection of the body, n. 99.
Rites, n. 28.

S

Sabellianism, n. 42, b.
Sacraments II, E, page 901.
Sacraments in general, n. 79.
Saints, n. 68.
Scholasticism, n. 11.

Schools of Philosophy, n. io.
Schools of Spirituality, n. 130.
Schools of Theology, n. 8.
Scotism, n. 8, b.
Scriptures (Holy), I, C, page 887.
Scriptures, source of doctrine, n. 20.
Semipelagianism, n. 44, b.
Sins, n. 106.
Soul, n. 13.
Spirit (religious, monastic), n. 128.
States (various), n. 115.
Suarezism, n. 8, b.
Subordinationism, n. 56.
Syncretism (religious), n. 41, e.
Systems (Christian philosophical), n. 12.

T

Temperance, η. 114.
Tendencies (doctrinal), n. 7.
Text of the Scriptures, n. 22.
Theology, n. 4.
Theology (ascetic), n. 116.
Theology (moral), III, A, page 906.
Theology (mystical), n. 78.
Theology (Trinitarian), n. 59.
Thomism, n. 8, b. and 12.
Tradition, I, /9, page 888.
Tradition, n. 27.
Treatises on morality, n. 104.
Treatises (doctrinal), n. 6.
Treatises on Spirituality, η. H7.
Trinity, II, B, page 895.
Truth, η. 112.

U

Unitarianism, n. 42, a.
Unity *of* the Church, n. 93-

V

Value of the Scriptures, n. 24.
Virtue, n. 107.
Veneration, n. 69.
Vices (capital), n. 121.
Virginity, n. 115.

W

Word, n. 55.

Imprimé en Belgique par la. So* iété S. Jean l'Evartgéüste, Dr.-ci/i>VCie, Tournai. — 3958

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

RINTEDIN USA

(Bibtiotfceca

fraternitas SoL^rdotaCis. Sancii Tetri